arXiv:1211.2869v1 [math.PR] 13 Nov 2012

MARTINGALE PROBLEMS UNDER NONLINEAR EXPECTATION

XIN GUO* CHEN PAN† AND SHIGE PENG‡

November 14, 2012

Abstract

We consider the martingale problem under the framework of a nonlinear expectation. We first establish an appropriate comparison theorem and the existence result for the associated state-dependent fully non-linear parabolic PDEs. We then construct the conditional expectation from the viscosity solution of the PDEs, and solve the existence of martingale problems. Under this non-linear expectation space, we further develop the stochastic integral and the Ito's type formula, which are consistent with Peng's G-framework. As an application, we introduce the notion of weak solution of SDE under the non-linear expectation. We remark that this weak solution is not unique.

MSC2000 subject classification: 60G40, 60H30, 49J10, 49K10, 93E20.

Key words and phrases: fully nonlinear PDE, martingale problem, nonlinear expectation, conditional expectation, weak solution to G-SDE.

1 Introduction

Our Problem and Main Results In this paper, we consider the following martingale problems under an appropriate non-linear expectation, analogous to the martingale problems in a probability space studied in the seminal paper of Stroock and Varadhan [SV69].

We start with a given continuous function $G : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ which satisfies the properties of subadditivity, positive homogeneity, monotonicity specified in section 2. We then set $\Omega = C_{x_0}(0, \infty; \mathbb{R}^d)$ and define $X_t(\omega) = \omega(t), \omega \in \Omega$. Now we consider the G-martingale problem in the following sense: find a family of operators $\{\mathcal{E}_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ on a nonlinear expectation space $(\Omega, \mathcal{H})$ such that

$$\varphi(X_t) - \int_0^t G(X_\theta, \varphi_x(X_\theta), \varphi_{xx}(X_\theta))\, d\theta, t \geq 0$$

is a $\{\mathcal{E}_t\}$-martingale for all $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

We study this problem by first establishing an appropriate comparison theorem and the existence result for the associated state-dependent fully non-linear parabolic PDEs, assuming additional

---

[*] Department of Industrial Engineering and Operations Research, UC Berkeley, CA 94720-1777, USA, `xinguo@ieor.berkeley.edu`

[†] Department of Mathematics, USTC, P.R. China, `panchen@mail.ustc.edu.cn`

[‡] School of Mathematics, Shandong University, P.R. China `peng@sdu.edu.cn`

regularity properties of G. This part of the result is largely drawn upon or slightly generalized from the existing PDEs theory. We then construct the conditional expectation, i.e. a family of operators $\{\mathcal{E}_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ from the viscosity solution of this PDE. Using the properties of this non-linear expectation, we show that

$$\mathcal{E}_s[\varphi(X_t)-\varphi(X_s)-\int_s^t G\left(X_\theta,\varphi_x(X_\theta),\varphi_{xx}(X_\theta)\right)d\theta]=0,\ 0\leq s<t<\infty.$$

Under this non-linear expectation space, we further develop the stochastic integral, and the Ito's type formula so that for $\varphi\in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ with $\varphi',\varphi''\in C_{l.Lip}(\mathbb{R})$, $0\leq s<t\leq T$,

$$\varphi(X_t)-\varphi(X_s)=\int_s^t\varphi'(X_\theta)\,dX_\theta+\frac{1}{2}\int_s^t\varphi''(X_\theta)\,d\langle X\rangle_\theta.$$

As an application, we introduce the notion of weak solution of SDE under the non-linear expectation. We remark that this weak solution is not unique.

Besides the sublinear case, we also consider a class of nonlinear expectations dominated by a sublinear expectation as in Chapter III in Peng [P10], and solve the related martingale problems.

Relation to existing works.

- Note that in the previous work of Peng's [P10], G is independent of state variable x and the corresponding G-stochastic integral is defined with respect to a special symmetric martingale G-Brownian motion. In this paper, we develop stochastic integrals with respect to the underlying general processes, which are not necessarily symmetric under the given nonlinear expectation space.
- Recently, a notion of random G-expectation was proposed in [N12], which allows the family of probabilities in the representation theorem of sublinear expectation to be path-dependent. In Nutz ([N12]), random sublinear expectations are constructed based on an optimal control formulation with path-dependent control sets. In our work, we construct the sublinear expectation directly from a fully nonlinear parabolic PDE. Our approach lends naturally an analytical tool to study the underlying stochastic processes (say X). For instance, we develop in this paper the stochastic integral and the quadratic variation processes, as well as Ito's type formula, as well as notion of the weak solution of the associated SDEs.
- We conjecture that by specifying appropriate class of G, one can define directly G-jump processes, see also [HP09]. This is an ongoing research project.

2 Preliminaries, Notations and Assumptions

Given a continuous function $G:\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{S}^d\to\mathbb{R}$. We assume that G satisfies the following conditions:

(A). (Subadditivity) $G(x,p+\bar{p},A+\bar{A})\leq G(x,p,A)+G(x,\bar{p},\bar{A})$;

(B). (Positive Homogeneity) $G(x,\lambda p,\lambda A)=\lambda G(x,p,A)$;

(C). (Monotonicity) $G(x,p,A) \leq G(x,p,A+\bar{\bar{A}})$;

for any $x,p,\bar{p} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $A, \bar{A}, \bar{\bar{A}} \in \mathbb{S}^d$, $\bar{\bar{A}} \geq 0$ and $\lambda \geq 0$.

If G satisfies conditions (A) and (B), then, by Theorem 2.1 in Chapter I in Peng [P10], for each given $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, there exists a bounded, closed and convex subset $U(x) \subset \mathbb{S}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$, such that

$$G(x,p,A) = \sup_{(a,b)\in U(x)} \{\mathrm{tr}[aA] + (b,p)\}.$$

Since, for each given x, there exists a dense subset $U_0(x) \subset U(x)$, which is countable, also denoted by $\{(\frac{1}{2}a(x,i), b(x,i))\}_{i,j\in\mathbb{N}}$, we can rewrite the above expression in the form

$$G(x,p,A) = \sup_{\gamma\in\Gamma} \left\{ \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}[a(x,\gamma)A] + (b(x,\gamma),p) \right\}, \tag{1}$$

where Γ is an index set, and $a(x,\gamma) \in \mathbb{S}^d, b(x,\gamma) \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

We also assume that G satisfies the condition

(D). $|G(x,p,A) - G(x,\bar{p},\bar{A})| \leq \rho(|p-\bar{p}| + |A-\bar{A}|)$, for any $x,p,\bar{p} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $A, \bar{A} \in \mathbb{S}^d$, where $\rho : [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ is continuous and $\rho(0) = 0$.

If G satisfies conditions (C) and (D), then there exists a positive constant Λ such that $|a(x,\gamma)|$, $|b(x,\gamma)| \leq \Lambda$ and $a(x,\gamma) \geq 0$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma$. And there exists $\sigma(x,\gamma) \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ such that $a(x,\gamma) = \sigma(x,\gamma)\sigma'(x,\gamma)$. Moreover, since G has the form (1), then G is uniformly Lipschitz continuous with respect to the last two arguments, i.e.

(D$'$) $|G(x,p,A) - G(x,\bar{p},\bar{A})| \leq L(|p-\bar{p}| + |A-\bar{A}|)$, for any $x,p,\bar{p} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $A, \bar{A} \in \mathbb{S}^d$, where the constant $L > 0$.

Remark 1 *If, for each x, $U(x) = [\underline{a}(x), \overline{a}(x)] \times [\underline{b}(x), \overline{b}(x)]$, one can take $a(x,\gamma_1) = \underline{a}(x) + [\overline{a}(x) - \underline{a}(x)]\gamma_1$ and $b(x,\gamma_2) = \underline{b}(x) + [\overline{b}(x) - \underline{b}(x)]\gamma_2$ with $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in [0,1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$. Furthermore, if we assume that $\sigma(\cdot,\gamma)$ and $b(\cdot,\gamma)$ are uniformly Lipschitz continuous, then G satisfies condition:*

(E) $G(x,\alpha(x-y),A) - G(y,\alpha(x-y),\bar{A}) \leq \bar{\rho}(\alpha|x-y|^2 + |x-y|)$ for every $x,y \in \mathbb{R}, \alpha > 0$ and $A, \bar{A} \in \mathbb{S}^d$, satisfying

$$-3\alpha \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \leq \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & -\bar{A} \end{pmatrix} \leq 3\alpha \begin{pmatrix} I & -I \\ -I & I \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\bar{\rho} : [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ is continuous and $\bar{\rho}(0) = 0$,

which will be useful for proving a comparison theorem, a key to our analysis.

PDEs associated with G Given such a G, now we introduce the associated state-dependent parabolic PDE

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - G(x, Du, D^2u) = 0, \ (t,x) \in (0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d, \\ u|_{t=0} = \varphi, \ x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \end{cases} \tag{GE}$$

This PDE is the focus of our martingale problem, and we will need more conditions on G to ensure the existence and regularities of its solution.

We first give the definition of viscosity solution to the above parabolic PDE.

Definition 1 *A viscosity subsolution of* (GE) *on* $(0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d$ *is a function* $u\in USC((0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ *such that for all* $(t,x)\in(0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d, \phi\in C^2((0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ *such that* $u(t,x)=\phi(t,x)$ *and* $u<\phi$ *on* $(0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d\setminus(t,x)$, *we have*

$$\partial_t\phi(t,x)-G(x,D\phi(t,x),D^2\phi(t,x))\le 0;$$

likewise, a viscosity supersolution of (GE) *on* $(0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d$ *is a function* $v\in LSC((0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ *such that for all* $(t,x)\in(0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d,\psi\in C^2((0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ *such that* $v(t,x)=\psi(t,x)$ *and* $v>\psi$ *on* $(0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d\setminus(t,x)$, *we have*

$$\partial_t\psi(t,x)-G(x,D\psi(t,x),D^2\psi(t,x))\ge 0.$$

And a viscosity solution of (GE) *on* $(0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d$ *is a function that is both a viscosity subsolution and a viscosity supersolution of* (GE) *on* $(0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d$.

We have the following result for the PDE (GE).

Theorem 1 (Comparison Theorem) *Given a continuous function* $G:\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{S}^d\to\mathbb{R}$, *which satisfies conditions* (A), (B), (C) *and* (D). *Suppose* σ,b *are uniformly Lipschitz continuous with respect to* x. *Let* $\underline{u}\in USC([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ *be a viscosity subsolution of* (GE) *and* $\overline{u}\in LSC([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ *be a viscosity supersolution of* (GE) *on* $[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d$ *with polynomial growth. Then* $\underline{u}\le\overline{u}$ *when* $\underline{u}|_{t=0}\le\overline{u}|_{t=0}$.

The proof for the **Comparison Theorem** in the **Appendix A** is based on Fleming and Soner [FS92], with slight modification.

Now we give Perron's existence result of the solution of (GE). First, let us introduce two notations: let $u:Q(\subset[0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d)\to[-\infty,\infty]$, we set

$$\begin{cases} u^*(t,x)=\lim_{r\downarrow 0}\sup\{(s,y)\in Q \text{ and } \sqrt{|s-t|+|y-x|^2}\le r\},\\ u_*(t,x)=\lim_{r\downarrow 0}\inf\{(s,y)\in Q \text{ and } \sqrt{|s-t|+|y-x|^2}\le r\}.\end{cases}$$

We call u^* the **upper semicontinuous envelope** of u, which is the smallest upper semicontinuous function larger than u. And u_* is the **lower semicontinuous envelope** of u.

Theorem 2 (Existence) *Assuming Comparison holds for* (GE). *Moreover, there is a viscosity subsolution of* (GE) $\underline{u}$ *and a viscosity supersolution* $\overline{u}$ *of* (GE) *that satisfy the condition* $\underline{u}_*|_{t=0}=\overline{u}^*|_{t=0}=\varphi\in C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ *with polynomial growth. Then*

$$w(t,x)=\sup\{W(t,x):\underline{u}\le W\le\overline{u} \text{ and } W \text{ is a viscosity subsolution of (GE)}\}$$

is a viscosity solution of (GE). *In particular, if* G *satisfies condition* (D), (GE) *has a solution.*

Proof. We only give the proof for the special case. Actually, if we assume $\varphi\in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then $\underline{u}(t,x)=\underline{M}t+\varphi(x)$ and $\overline{u}(t,x)=\overline{M}t+\varphi(x)$ are the subsolution and supersolution of (GE) respectively, where $\underline{M}=\inf_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d}G(x,D\varphi(x),D^2\varphi(x))\in\mathbb{R}$ and $\overline{M}=\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d}G(x,D\varphi(x),D^2\varphi(x))\in\mathbb{R}$. For $\varphi\in C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with polynomial growth, one can refer to Appendix C.3 in Peng [P10]. $\square$

Moreover, since G satisfies conditions (A),(B) and (C), the solution of (GE) has the following properties.

Theorem 3 (Properties of The Solution) *Let G satisfy conditions (A),(B) and (C) in the* **Introduction***. Let $u^{\varphi} \in C([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ denote the solution with polynomial growth of (GE), then*

$$\begin{aligned} u^{\lambda\varphi} &= \lambda u^{\varphi},\ \lambda \geq 0, \\ u^{\varphi+\bar{\varphi}} &\leq u^{\varphi} + u^{\bar{\varphi}}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, we have the identity

$$u^{\varphi+c} = u^{\varphi} + c,$$

where $c \in \mathbb{R}$ is a constant.

Finally, we need some regularity properties for the PDE. We fist assume that the PDE (GE) is uniformly parabolic, i.e.

(F). there are positive functions λ_0 and Λ_0 on $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$\lambda_0 \mathrm{Trace}(\bar{A}) \leq G(x,p,A+\bar{A}) - G(x,p,A) \leq \Lambda_0 \mathrm{Trace}(\bar{A}),\ \bar{A} \geq 0, \tag{2}$$

and the ratio Λ_0/λ_0 is finite.

We next follow the notation in Krylov [K87] for more regularity results. Given constants $K \geq \varepsilon > 0$ and set $Q = (0,T) \times \mathbb{R}^d$, we define

Definition 2 *Let $G : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ be given, which is written as $G(x,u,u_i,u_{ij})$, $i,j = 1,\dots,d$. We shall denote $G \in \mathcal{G}(\varepsilon,K,Q)$ if the function G is twice continuously differentiable with respect to (x,u,u_i,u_{ij}) and for all real-valued $u_{ij} = u_{ji}, \tilde{u}_{ij} = \tilde{u}_{ji}, u_i, \tilde{u}_i, u, \tilde{u}$ and ξ_i, the conditions*

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon|\xi|^2 &\leq G_{u_{ij}}\xi_i\xi_j \leq K|\xi|^2, \\ |G - G_{u_{ij}}u_{ij}| &\leq M_1^G(u)(1 + \sum_i (u_i)^2), \\ \sum_i |G_{x_i}|(1+\sum_i |u_i|)^{-1} + |G_u| + \sum_i |G_{u_i}|(1+\sum_i |u_i|) &\leq M_1^G(u)(1 + \sum_i |u_i|^2 + \sum_{i,j}|u_{ij}|), \\ M_2^G(u,u_k)^{-1} G_{(\eta)(\eta)} &\leq \sum_{i,j} |\tilde{u}_{ij}| \big[\sum_i |\tilde{u}_i| \\ &\quad + (1 + \sum_{i,j}|u_{ij}|)(|\tilde{u}| + |\tilde{x}|) \big] \\ &\quad + \sum_i |\tilde{u}_i|^2 (1 + \sum_{i,j}|u_{ij}|) \\ &\quad + (1 + \sum_{i,j}|u_{ij}|^3)(|\tilde{u}|^2 + |\tilde{x}|^2) \end{aligned}$$

are satisfied, where $\eta = (\tilde{x}, \tilde{u}, \tilde{u}_i, \tilde{u}_{ij})$ *and*

$$\begin{aligned} G_{(\eta)(\eta)} = & G_{u_{ij}u_{rs}}\tilde{u}_{ij}\tilde{u}_{rs} + 2G_{u_{ij}u_r}\tilde{u}_{ij}\tilde{u}_r + 2G_{u_{ij}u}\tilde{u}_{ij}\tilde{u} + 2G_{u_{ij}x_r}\tilde{u}_{ij}\tilde{x}_r + 2G_{u_iu_j}\tilde{u}_i\tilde{u}_j + 2G_{u_iu}\tilde{u}_i\tilde{u} \\ & + 2G_{u_ix_j}\tilde{u}_i\tilde{x}_j + G_{uu}|\tilde{u}|^2 + 2G_{ux_i}\tilde{u}\tilde{x}_i + 2G_{x_ix_j}\tilde{x}_i\tilde{x}_j. \end{aligned}$$

$M_1^G(u)$ *and* $M_2^G(u, u_k)$ *are some continuous functions which grow with* $|u|$ *and* $u_k u_k$ *and* $M_2^G \geq 1$.

Definition 3 *Let* G *be given. We write* $G \in \bar{\mathcal{G}}(\varepsilon, K, Q)$ *if there exists a sequence* $G_n \in \mathcal{G}(\varepsilon, K, Q)$ *converging to* G *as* $n \to \infty$ *at every point* $(x, u, u_i, u_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}^d$ *such that*

(i) $M_l^{G_n} = M_l^G$, $l = 1, 2$ *and* $n = 1, 2, \ldots$;

(ii) for each $n = 1, 2, \ldots$, *the function* G_n *is infinitely differentiable with respect to* (x, u, u_i, u_{ij});

(iii) there exist constants $\delta_0 =: \delta_0^G > 0$ *and* $M_0 =: M_0^G > 0$ *such that*

$$G_n(x, -M_0, 0, u_{ij}) \geq \delta_0, \ G_n(x, M_0, 0, -u_{ij}) \leq -\delta_0$$

for all $n \geq 1, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ *and* $(u_{ij}) \in \mathbb{S}^d$.

Remark 2 *According to example 6.1.8 in [K87], we give an example in our case. Let* Γ *be a set of indices. Given* $a^{ij}(x, \gamma), b^i(x, \gamma) : \mathbb{R} \times \Gamma \to \mathbb{R}$ *s.t.* $a^{ij}(\cdot, \gamma), b^i(\cdot, \gamma) \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R}), i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, d$. *Assume that*

$$\varepsilon|\xi|^2 \leq a^{ij}\xi^i\xi^j \leq K|\xi|^2, \text{ for all } \gamma \in \Gamma \text{ and } x \in \mathbb{R},$$

then

$$F(x, u, u_i, u_{ij}) := \sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma}\{a^{ij}(x, \gamma)u_{ij} + b^i(x, \gamma)u_i - u\} \in \bar{\mathcal{G}}(\varepsilon, K, Q).$$

If G *has the form (1), set* $\bar{G}(x, u, u_i, u_{ij}) := G(x, u_i, u_{ij}) - u$, *one can easily check that* $u(t, x) := e^t\bar{u}(t, x)$ *is a solution of (GE), provided that* $\bar{u}$ *is a solution of*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t\bar{u} - \bar{G}(x, u, Du, D^2u) = 0, \ (t, x) \in (0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \bar{u}|_{t=0} = \varphi, \ x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \end{cases}$$

Now referring to Theorem 6.4.3 and 6.4.4 in Krylov [K87], we give the following regularity results.

Theorem 4 *Suppose that* $G \in \bar{\mathcal{G}}(\varepsilon, K, Q)$ *and* $\varphi \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$. *Then the PDE (GE) has a solution* u *possessing the following properties:*

I) $u \in C_b([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$;

II) there exists a constant $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ *only depending on* d, K, ε *such that for each* $\kappa > 0$, $\|u\|_{C^{2+\alpha}([\kappa, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)} < \infty$.

Furthermore, if $\varphi \in C^{2+\alpha_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ *and bounded, then* $u \in C^{2+\alpha_1}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ *for some* $\alpha_1 \in (0, \alpha_0 \wedge 1]$. *Where* $u \in C^\alpha(Q)$, *if*

$$\|u\|_{C^\alpha(Q)} := \sup_{\substack{x \neq y, x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d \\ s \neq t, s, t \in [0, T]}} \frac{|u(t, x) - u(s, y)|}{(|t - s|^{\frac{1}{2}} + |x - y|)^\alpha} < \infty.$$

Outstanding Assumption *Throughout the paper, unless otherwise specified, we always assume the conditions (A), (B), (C), (D′), (F) and* $G \in \bar{\mathcal{G}}(\varepsilon, K, Q)$.

These assumptions will guarantee the existence and uniqueness of the viscosity solution to the PDE (GE) with sufficient regularity for our subsequent analysis.

3 The Martingale Problems

3.1 Martingale Problems for G

Now, referring to Peng [P05], we define the 'conditional expectation' $\mathcal{E}_t$ according to the operator: $\mathcal{T}_t[\varphi(\cdot)](x) := u(t,x)$, where u is the unique viscosity solution of the PDE (GE).

We set $\Omega = C_{x_0}(0,\infty;\mathbb{R}^d)$, $X_t(\omega) = \omega_t$, $\omega \in \Omega$ is canonical. Let us assume that φ_0 in a proper function space on $(\mathbb{R}^d)^N$ denoted by $\mathcal{C}((\mathbb{R}^d)^N)$, set $\xi(\omega) = \varphi_0(X_{t_1}, \cdots, X_{t_N})$, $0 = t_0 \le t_1 \le \cdots \le t_N \le T$. For $0 \le j \le N$, we define the conditional expectation $\mathcal{E}_t[\xi]$ in the following way

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi_1(x_1,\cdots,x_{N-1}) &= \mathcal{T}_{t_N - t_{N-1}}[\varphi_0(x_1,\cdots,x_{N-1},\cdot)](x_{N-1}),\\
&\vdots\\
\varphi_{N-j}(x_1,\cdots,x_j) &= \mathcal{T}_{t_{j+1}-t_j}[\varphi_{N-j-1}(x_1,\cdots,x_j,\cdot)](x_j),\\
&\vdots\\
\varphi_{N-1}(x_1) &= \mathcal{T}_{t_2-t_1}[\varphi_{N-2}(x_1,\cdot)](x_1),\\
\varphi_N &= \mathcal{T}_{t_1}[\varphi_{N-1}(\cdot)](x_0),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\varphi_k \in \mathcal{C}((\mathbb{R}^d)^{N-k}),\ 0 \le k \le N-1$ and $\varphi_N \in \mathbb{R}$. Then we define

$$\mathcal{E}_t[\xi] = \varphi_{N-j}(\omega_{t_1},\cdots,\omega_{t_j}),\ \text{if } t = t_j, 0 \le j \le N,$$

and denote the so called 'expectation' by $\mathcal{E} := \mathcal{E}_0$.

Remark 3 *We can set* $\mathcal{C}((\mathbb{R}^d)^N) := C_{l.Lip}((\mathbb{R}^d)^N)$ *as in [P10], where* $C_{l.Lip}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *is the space of real valued continuous functions defined on* $\mathbb{R}^n$ *such that*

$$|\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)| \le C(1 + |x|^m + |y|^m)|x-y|, \forall\, x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

for some $C > 0, m \in \mathbb{N}$ *depending on* φ.

And we set $\mathcal{H} := L_{ip} = \{\varphi(X_{t_1},\cdots,X_{t_N}); \varphi \in C_{l.Lip}((\mathbb{R}^d)^N)$ *for some* $N \in \mathbb{N}$ *and* $0 \le t_1 \le \cdots \le t_N \le T\}$, *and call* $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ *a nonlinear expectation space. If* $\xi = \varphi(X_{t_1},\cdots,X_{t_N})$ *with* $t_N \le t \in [0,T]$, *we say* $\xi \in \mathcal{F}_t$, *where* $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(\{X_\theta; \theta \in [0,t]\})$ *is the* σ*-field generated by* X.

From the above construction and the properties of the solutions to PDE (GE), we see

Proposition 5 *Given a nonlinear expectation space* $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$. *Let* $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}$.

(I) Monotonicity

$$\mathcal{E}[\xi] \le \mathcal{E}[\eta] \ \textit{if}\ \xi \le \eta.$$

(II) Subadditivity

$$\mathcal{E}_t[\xi+\eta] \le \mathcal{E}_t[\xi] + \mathcal{E}_t[\eta].$$

(III) Positive homogeneity

$$\mathcal{E}_t[\lambda\xi] = \lambda\mathcal{E}_t[\xi] \text{ for any constant } \lambda \ge 0.$$

(IV) Constant preserving

If $\xi \in \mathcal{F}_s$ and $\eta \in \mathcal{F}_{s+h}, s, h \ge 0$ we have

$$\mathcal{E}_s[\xi+\eta] = \xi + \mathcal{E}_s[\eta].$$

Particularly, $\mathcal{E}[\xi+c] = \mathcal{E}[\xi] + c, c \in \mathbb{R}$ is a constant.

(V) Tower property

$$\mathcal{E}_s \circ \mathcal{E}_{s+h} = \mathcal{E}_s,\ \ h > 0.$$

(VI) If $\xi \in \mathcal{F}_s$ and $\eta \in \mathcal{F}_{s+h}$ we have

$$\mathcal{E}_s[\xi\eta] = \xi^+\mathcal{E}_s[\eta] + \xi^-\mathcal{E}_s[-\eta].$$

(VII) For $\varphi \in C_{l.Lip}(\mathbb{R})$, we have

$$\mathcal{E}_s[\varphi(X_t)] = u^\varphi(t-s, X_s),\ \text{ if } s \le t.$$

Proof. (I) is an implication of **Comparison Theorem**. (II) and (III) can be derived directly from Theorem 3 and the construction procedure.

For (IV), without loss of generality, assume $\xi = \varphi(X_s), \eta = \phi(X_{s+h}),\ \varphi, \phi \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_s[\xi+\eta] =& \mathcal{E}_s[\varphi(X_s) + \phi(X_{s+h})] \\ =& \mathcal{T}_h[\varphi(y) + \phi(\cdot)](y)|_{y=X_s} \\ =& \varphi(X_s) + \mathcal{T}_h[\phi(\cdot)](y)|_{y=X_s} \\ =& \xi + \mathcal{E}_s[\eta],\end{aligned}$$

where the third equality is implied by Theorem 3.

To show (V), without loss of generality, we assume $\xi = \varphi_0(X_{t_1}, X_{t_2}, X_{t_3}), t_1 = s, t_2 = s+h, t_2 \le t_3 \le T, \varphi_0 \in \mathcal{C}((\mathbb{R}^d)^3)$. Then

$$\mathcal{E}_{t_2}[\xi] = \varphi_1(X_{t_1}, X_{t_2}) \text{ and } \mathcal{E}_{t_1}[\xi] = \varphi_2(X_{t_1}), \varphi_1 \in \mathcal{C}((\mathbb{R}^d)^2), \varphi_2 \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

from the construction procedure. While

$$\mathcal{E}_{t_1}[\mathcal{E}_{t_2}[\xi]] = \mathcal{E}_{t_1}[\varphi_1(X_{t_1}, X_{t_2})] = \bar{\varphi}_2(X_{t_1}),$$

where $\bar{\varphi}_2(x) = \mathcal{T}_{t_2-t_1}[\varphi_1(x,\cdot)](x) = \varphi_2(x)$, since the PDE (GE) has a unique solution for a given initial condition.

To prove (VI), assume $\xi = \varphi(X_s), \eta = \phi(X_{s+h})$, $\varphi, \phi \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then, by Theorem 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_s[\xi\eta] &= \mathcal{E}_s[\varphi(X_s)\phi(X_{s+h})] \\ &= \mathcal{T}_h[\varphi(y)\phi(\cdot)](y)|_{y=X_s} \\ &= \mathcal{T}_h[\varphi(y)^+\phi(\cdot) - \varphi(y)^-\phi(\cdot)](y)|_{y=X_s} \\ &= \{\varphi(y)^+\mathcal{T}_h[\phi(\cdot)] + \varphi(y)^-\mathcal{T}_h[-\phi(\cdot)](y)\}|_{y=X_s} \\ &= \xi^+\mathcal{T}_h[\phi(\cdot)]_{y=X_s} + \xi^-\mathcal{T}_h[-\phi(\cdot)]_{y=X_s} \\ &= \xi^+\mathcal{E}_s[\eta] + \xi^-\mathcal{E}_s[-\eta].\end{aligned}$$

For (VII), note the fact that $\varphi(X_t) = \varphi(X_t + X_s - X_s) =: \psi(X_s, X_t)$,

$$\mathcal{E}_s[\varphi(X_t)] = \mathcal{E}_s[\psi(X_s, X_t)] = \mathcal{T}_{t-s}[\psi(x_1, \cdot)](x_1)|_{x_1=X_s} = u^\varphi(t-s, x_1)|_{x_1=X_s}.$$

□

Remark 4 *It is worth mentioning that the above construction procedure depends on the homogeneity of the PDE (GE), otherwise the nonlinear expectation is not well-defined. Let us see an example. Consider the following linear nonhomogeneous PDE with a constant initial data*

$$\begin{cases}\partial_t u - \partial^2_{xx}u = x, \ (t,x) \in (0,T] \times \mathbb{R}, \\ u|_{t=0} = c.\end{cases}$$

The solution is $u(t,x) = tx + c$. Let us try to define conditional expectation $\mathcal{E}_s$ as the former construction procedure, and consider the constant as a function

$$\phi_0 : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \{c\}; (x_1, x_2) \mapsto \phi_0(x_1, x_2).$$

Then

$$c = \phi_0(X_{t_1}, X_{t_2}), \ \forall t_1 \le t_2 \in (0,T].$$

And

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_{t_1}[c] = \mathcal{T}_{t_2-t_1}[\phi_0(x_1, \cdot)]_{x_1=X_{t_1}} = [(t_2-t_1)x_1 + c]|_{x_1=X_{t_1}} =: \phi_1(x_1)|_{x_1=X_{t_1}}, \\ \mathcal{E}_0[\phi_1(X_{t_1})] = t_1X_0 + (t_2-t_1)X_0 + c = t_2X_0 + c.\end{aligned}$$

We obtain $\mathcal{E}[c] = t_2X_0 + c$. Since t_2 is arbitrary, the construction of nonlinear expectation is not well-defined for nonhomogeneous PDE.

We will state our main theorem here. For simplicity, let $d = 1$. Firstly, referring to Lemma 3.3 in Chapter I in Peng [P10], we give a technique lemma.

Lemma 6 *Given a nonlinear expectation space $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$. Let $X \in \mathcal{H}$ be given. Then for each sequence $\{\varphi_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying $\varphi_n \downarrow 0$, we have $\mathcal{E}[\varphi_n(X)] \downarrow 0$.*

Proof. For each fixed $N > 0$,

$$\varphi_n(x) \leq k_n^N + \varphi_1(x)\mathbf{1}_{[|x|>N]} \leq k_n^N + \frac{\varphi_1(x)|x|}{N} \text{ for each } x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where $k_n^N = \max_{|x|\leq N} \varphi_n(x)$. We then have

$$\mathcal{E}[\varphi_n(X)] \leq k_n^N + \frac{1}{N}\mathcal{E}[\varphi_1(X)|X|]. \tag{3}$$

It follows from $\varphi_n \downarrow 0$ that $k_n^N \downarrow 0$. Thus we get

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{E}[\varphi_n(X)] \leq \frac{1}{N}\mathcal{E}[\varphi_1(X)|X|].$$

At last, letting $N \to \infty$, we derive that $\mathcal{E}[\varphi_n(X)] \downarrow 0$. □

Remark 5 *In the proof the above lemma, we used monotonicity, constant preserving and positive homogeneity of the nonlinear expectation $\mathcal{E}$ to show the key inequality (3), except the subadditivity.*

Theorem 7 (Martingale Problem) *Assume that G satisfies the conditions in Theorem 1, and condition (D′). And $G \in \bar{\mathcal{G}}(\varepsilon, K, Q)$, $\varphi \in C_b^{2+\alpha_0}(\mathbb{R}), \alpha_0 > 0$. Then we have*

$$\mathcal{E}_s[\varphi(X_t) - \varphi(X_s) - \int_s^t G\left(X_\theta, \varphi_x(X_\theta), \varphi_{xx}(X_\theta)\right) d\theta] = 0,\ 0 \leq s \leq t < \infty. \tag{4}$$

Proof. To prove (4), we set $\pi = \{\theta_i; 1 \leq i \leq K, \theta_0 = s < \theta_1 < \cdots < \theta_K = t, K \in \mathbb{N}\}, \|\pi\| = \max_{1\leq k\leq K} |\Delta\theta_k|, \Delta\theta_k = \theta_k - \theta_{k-1},$ and $g(X_\theta) := G\left(X_\theta, \varphi_x(X_\theta), \varphi_{xx}(X_\theta)\right)$.

First, let us consider

$$\mathcal{E}_s[\sum_{k=1}^K \{\varphi(X_{\theta_k}) - \varphi(X_{\theta_{k-1}}) - g(X_{\theta_{k-1}})\Delta\theta_k\}]. \tag{5}$$

Since, by Theorem 4, there exists some $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0 \wedge 1]$ such that $\partial_t u$ is uniformly $\frac{\alpha}{2}$-Hölder continuous in t, using Proposition 5 (IV) and (VII), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{E}_{\theta_{k-1}}[\varphi(X_{\theta_k}) - \varphi(X_{\theta_{k-1}}) - g(X_{\theta_{k-1}})\Delta\theta_k] \\
&= \mathcal{E}_{\theta_{k-1}}[\varphi(X_{\theta_k})] - \varphi(X_{\theta_{k-1}}) - g(X_{\theta_{k-1}})\Delta\theta_k \\
&= u(\Delta\theta_k, X_{\theta_{k-1}}) - u(0, X_{\theta_{k-1}}) - g(X_{\theta_{k-1}})\Delta\theta_k \\
&= \left[\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(0, X_{\theta_{k-1}}) - g(X_{\theta_{k-1}})\right]\Delta\theta_k + O((\Delta\theta_k)^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}) \\
&= O((\Delta\theta_k)^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used $\partial_t u(0,x) - G(x, \varphi_x(x), \varphi_{xx}(x)) = 0$ in the last equality. That is, we get the estimate

$$|\mathcal{E}_{\theta_{k-1}}[\varphi(X_{\theta_k}) - \varphi(X_{\theta_{k-1}}) - g(X_{\theta_{k-1}})\Delta\theta_k]| \leq C(\Delta\theta_k)^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}},$$

for some constant C depends only on the norm of u in $C^{2+\alpha}([0,T]\times\mathbb{R})$ with $T\geq t$.

By the tower property and monotonicity of conditional expectation $\mathcal{E}_t$, we have

$$\mathcal{E}_s[\sum_{k=1}^{K}\{\varphi(X_{\theta_k})-\varphi(X_{\theta_{k-1}})-G(\theta_{k-1})\Delta\theta_k\}]=o(1),\ \text{as } \|\pi\|\to 0.$$

To see this, let us consider a simple case:
If $s<\theta<t$, then by the tower property we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{E}_s[\varphi(X_\theta)-\varphi(X_s)-g(X_s)(\theta-s)+[\varphi(X_t)-\varphi(X_\theta)-g(X_\theta)(t-\theta)]]\\=&\mathcal{E}_s[\varphi(X_\theta)-\varphi(X_s)-g(X_s)(\theta-s)+\mathcal{E}_\theta[\varphi(X_t)-\varphi(X_\theta)-g(X_\theta)(t-\theta)]].\end{aligned}$$

Then, by the monotonicity of the conditional expectation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{E}_s[\varphi(X_\theta)-\varphi(X_s)-g(X_s)(\theta-s)+\mathcal{E}_\theta[\varphi(X_t)-\varphi(X_\theta)-g(X_\theta)(t-\theta)]]\\\leq&\mathcal{E}_s[\varphi(X_\theta)-\varphi(X_s)-g(X_s)(\theta-s)+|\mathcal{E}_\theta[\varphi(X_t)-\varphi(X_\theta)-g(X_\theta)(t-\theta)]|]\\\leq&|\mathcal{E}_s[\varphi(X_\theta)-\varphi(X_s)-g(X_s)(\theta-s)]|+C(t-\theta)^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}\\\leq&C[(\theta-s)^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}+(t-\theta)^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}]\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{E}_s[\varphi(X_\theta)-\varphi(X_s)-g(X_s)(\theta-s)+\mathcal{E}_\theta[\varphi(X_t)-\varphi(X_\theta)-g(X_\theta)(t-\theta)]]\\\geq&\mathcal{E}_s[\varphi(X_\theta)-\varphi(X_s)-g(X_s)(\theta-s)-|\mathcal{E}_\theta[\varphi(X_t)-\varphi(X_\theta)-g(X_\theta)(t-\theta)]|]\\\geq&\mathcal{E}_s[\varphi(X_\theta)-\varphi(X_s)-g(X_s)(\theta-s)]-C(t-\theta)^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}\\\geq&-|\mathcal{E}_s[\varphi(X_\theta)-\varphi(X_s)-g(X_s)(\theta-s)]|-C(t-\theta)^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}\\\geq&-C[(\theta-s)^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}+(t-\theta)^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}],\end{aligned}$$

which imply

$$|\mathcal{E}_s[\varphi(X_\theta)-\varphi(X_s)-g(X_s)(\theta-s)+\mathcal{E}_\theta[\varphi(X_t)-\varphi(X_\theta)-g(X_\theta)(t-\theta)]]|\leq C[(\theta-s)^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}+(t-\theta)^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}].$$

At last, we need to estimate the difference between (5) and the left hand side of (4). Since $\mathcal{E}[\int_s^t g(X_\theta)\,d\theta]$ is defined properly, and from Lemma 6 we can derive a monotone convergence result w.r.t. $\mathcal{E}$, i.e. $\mathcal{E}[\xi_n]\downarrow 0$, as $\xi_n\downarrow 0$ in $\mathcal{H}$, then we can choose a sequence of the partition π_n of the interval $[s,t]$ such that $|\int_s^t g(X_\theta)\,d\theta-\sum_{\pi_n}g(X_{\theta_{k-1}})\Delta\theta_k|\downarrow 0$ as $\|\pi_n\|\to 0$.

Hence, we get that the difference between (5) and the left hand side of (4)

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{E}\left[\left|\mathcal{E}_s\left[\varphi(X_t)-\varphi(X_s)-\int_s^t G\left(X_\theta,\varphi_x(X_\theta),\varphi_{xx}(X_\theta)\right)d\theta\right]\right.\right.\\&\left.\left.-\mathcal{E}_s\left[\sum_{\pi_n}\{\varphi(X_{\theta_k})-\varphi(X_{\theta_{k-1}})-g(X_{\theta_{k-1}})\Delta\theta_k\}\right]\right|\right]\\\leq&\mathcal{E}\left[\left|\int_s^t g(X_\theta)\,d\theta-\sum_{\pi_n}g(X_{\theta_{k-1}})\Delta\theta_k\right|\right]\downarrow 0\text{ as }\|\pi_n\|\to 0.\end{aligned}$$

We have proved the equation (4). ∎

Remark 6 *1) Since* $\mathcal{E}[|\int_0^t g(X_\theta)\,d\theta|] \le \int_0^t \mathcal{E}[|g(X_\theta)|]\,d\theta$*, we can define* $\mathcal{E}[\int_0^t g(X_\theta)\,d\theta]$ *for* $g(X)$ *such that* $\mathcal{E}[|g(X)|]$ *is integrable on* $[0,T]$*, and* $g(X)$ *can be approximated by a sequence of simple processes.*

2) From the above proof, we can see that the only properties of the expectation we used are Proposition 5 (I),(IV),(V) and (VII).

In fact, we can generalize the martingale problem for polynomials instead of φ.

Theorem 8 (Martingale Problem for Polynomials) *Suppose* G *satisfies the same conditions as in Theorem 7, then the process*

$$\varphi(X_t) - \int_0^t G(X_\theta, \varphi_x(X_\theta), \varphi_{xx}(X_\theta))\,d\theta, t \ge 0$$

is an $\{\mathcal{E}_t\}-$*martingale for all* φ *that is a polynomial on* $\mathbb{R}$*.*

Proof. Actually, we can use Lemma 6 to show this result.

One can find a process $\varphi_n \in C_b^3(\mathbb{R})$, such that $|\varphi_n - \varphi| \downarrow 0$, $|\varphi_n' - \varphi'| \downarrow 0$ and $|\varphi_n'' - \varphi''| \downarrow 0$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\mathcal{E}_s[\varphi(X_t) - \varphi(X_s) - \int_s^t G(X_\theta, \varphi'(X_\theta), \varphi''(X_\theta))\,d\theta]\right| \\
\le &\left|\mathcal{E}_s[\varphi(X_t) - \varphi(X_s) - \int_s^t G(X_\theta, \varphi'(X_\theta), \varphi''(X_\theta))\,d\theta]\right. \\
&\left. - \mathcal{E}_s[\varphi_n(X_t) - \varphi_n(X_s) - \int_s^t G(X_\theta, \varphi_n'(X_\theta), \varphi_n''(X_\theta))\,d\theta]\right| \\
\le &\mathcal{E}_s[|\varphi(X_t) - \varphi_n(X_t)|] + \mathcal{E}_s[|\varphi(X_s) - \varphi_n(X_s)|] \\
&+ \int_s^t \mathcal{E}_s[|G(X_\theta, \varphi'(X_\theta), \varphi''(X_\theta)) - G(X_\theta, \varphi_n'(X_\theta), \varphi_n''(X_\theta))|]\,d\theta \\
\le &\mathcal{E}_s[|\varphi(X_t) - \varphi_n(X_t)|] + \mathcal{E}_s[|\varphi(X_s) - \varphi_n(X_s)|] \\
&+ L\int_s^t \mathcal{E}_s[|\varphi'(X_\theta) - \varphi_n'(X_\theta)| + |\varphi''(X_\theta) - \varphi_n''(X_\theta)|]\,d\theta \to 0, \text{ as } n \to \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

□

3.2 Martingale Problems for Dominated Nonlinear Expectations

In this section, we consider a class of nonlinear expectations dominated by a 'sublinear' expectation $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$, in the sense

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}[\xi] - \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}[\eta] \le \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\xi - \eta],$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ is a sublinear expectation with properties Proposition 5 (I),(II),(III) and (IV).

First, let us consider a continuous function $\bar{G} : [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}^d \to \mathbb{R}$. Assume that

(a). (subadditivity) $\bar{G}(t,x,v+v',p+p',A+A') \le \bar{G}(t,x,v,p,A) + \bar{G}(t,x,v',p',A')$;

(b). (positive homogeneity) $\bar{G}(t,x,\lambda v,\lambda p,\lambda A)=\lambda\bar{G}(t,x,v,p,A)$;

(c). (monotonicity) $\bar{G}(t,x,v,p,A)\leq\bar{G}(t,x,v,p,A'')$;

for any $(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d$, $v,v'\in\mathbb{R}$, $p,p'\in\mathbb{R}^d$, $A,A',A''\in\mathbb{S}^d$, $A\leq A''$ and $\lambda\geq 0$.

We now consider the following nonlinear parabolic PDE

$$\begin{cases}\partial_t u(t,x)-\bar{G}(t,x,u(t,x),Du(t,x),D^2u(t,x))=0,(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d,\\ u(0,x)=\varphi(x),x\in\mathbb{R}^d.\end{cases}\tag{$\overline{\text{GE}}$}$$

To make sure the above equation ($\overline{\text{GE}}$) has a unique solution, we impose the following conditions:

(d). (Lipschitz continuity) $|\bar{G}(t,x,v,p,A)-\bar{G}(t,x,v',p',A')|\leq\bar{L}(|v-v'|+|p-p'|+|A-A'|)$, for $(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d, v,v'\in\mathbb{R}, p,p'\in\mathbb{R}^d, A,A'\in\mathbb{S}^d$ and a positive constant $\bar{L}$.

And

(g). (condition (G))
$|\bar{G}(t,x,v,p,A)-\bar{G}(t,y,v,p,A)|\leq\bar{\rho}_G(1+(T-t)^{-1}+|x|+|y|+|v|)\rho_G(|x-y|+|p|\cdot|x-y|)$, for each $t\in[0,T), v\in\mathbb{R}, x,y,p\in\mathbb{R}^d$ and $A\in\mathbb{S}^d$, where $\rho_G,\bar{\rho}_G:[0,\infty)\to[0,\infty)$ are continuous functions that satisfy $\rho_G(0)=0,\bar{\rho}_G(0)=0$.

Referring to Theorem 2.4 in Appendix C in Peng [P10], we have the comparison theorem.

Theorem 9 *Suppose $\bar{G}$ satisfies conditions (c),(d) and (g). Let $\underline{u}\in USC([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a viscosity subsolution of ($\overline{\text{GE}}$), and $\overline{u}\in LSC([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a viscosity supersolution of ($\overline{\text{GE}}$) on $(0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying polynomial growth condition. Then $\underline{u}\leq\overline{u}$ on $[0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d$ provided that $\underline{u}|_{t=0}\leq\overline{u}|_{t=0}$.*

Similar to the proof of Theorem 2, we have the following existence result.

Theorem 10 *Suppose $\bar{G}$ satisfies conditions (c),(d) and (g), and $\bar{G}(t,x,0,0,0)$ is bounded in $[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d$. If $\varphi\in C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with polynomial growth, then the problem ($\overline{\text{GE}}$) has a unique solution.*

Thanks to Theorem 2.5 in the Appendix C in Peng [P10], we are able to consider the following type of nonlinear parabolic PDE:

$$\begin{cases}\partial_t u(t,x)-\widetilde{G}(t,x,u(t,x),Du(t,x),D^2u(t,x))=0,(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d,\\ u(0,x)=\varphi(x),x\in\mathbb{R}^d,\end{cases}\tag{$\widetilde{\text{GE}}$}$$

where the continuous function $\widetilde{G}:[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{S}^d\to\mathbb{R}$ satisfies the condition

$$\widetilde{G}(t,x,v,p,A)-\widetilde{G}(t,x,v',p',A')\leq\bar{G}(t,x,v-v',p-p',A-A'),\tag{DOM}$$

for each $(t,x)\in[0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d$ and $(v,p,A),(v',p',A')\in\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{S}^d$.

Referring to Theorem 2.5 in the Appendix C in Peng [P10], we have the comparison result for equation ($\widetilde{\text{GE}}$).

Theorem 11 *Suppose both* $\bar{G}$ *and* $\widetilde{G}$ *satisfy condition* (g). *If* $\bar{G}$ *satisfies conditions* (c),(d) *and* $\widetilde{G}$ *satisfies condition* (DOM). *Let* $\underline{\widetilde{u}} \in USC([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ *be a subsolution of* ($\widetilde{\text{GE}}$) *and* $\overline{\widetilde{u}} \in LSC([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ *be a supersolution of* ($\widetilde{\text{GE}}$) *on* $(0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d$ *and* $\overline{w}$ *is a supersolution of* ($\overline{\text{GE}}$). *They all satisfy the polynomial growth condition. If* $(\underline{\widetilde{u}} - \overline{\widetilde{u}})|_{t=0} = \overline{w}|_{t=0}$, *then* $\underline{\widetilde{u}} - \overline{\widetilde{u}} \le \overline{w}$ *on* $[0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d$.

In particular, $\underline{\widetilde{u}} \le \overline{\widetilde{u}}$ *on* $[0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d$ *provided that* $\underline{\widetilde{u}}|_{t=0} \le \overline{\widetilde{u}}|_{t=0}$.

Remark 7 *Addition to the conditions given in the above theorem, if we assume* $\bar{G}$ *satisfies condition* (b), *then* $\widetilde{G}$ *still satisfies the monotonicity condition, i.e.*

$$\widetilde{G}(t,x,v,p,A) - \widetilde{G}(t,x,v,p,A'') \le \bar{G}(t,x,0,0,A-A'') \le \bar{G}(t,x,0,0,0) = 0,$$

for any $(t,x,v,p) \in [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d$ *and* $A, A'' \in \mathbb{S}^d, A \le A''$.

Set $\underline{G}(t,x,v,p,A) := -\bar{G}(t,x,-v,-p,-A)$, then it is easy to verify that $\underline{G}$ satisfies condition (c),(d) and (g) when $\bar{G}$ satisfies these conditions. Assume that $\widetilde{G}(t,x,0,0,0) = 0$, then $\underline{G}(t,x,v,p,A) \le \widetilde{G}(t,x,v,p,A) \le \bar{G}(t,x,v,p,A)$.

One can easily see that a viscosity solution of ($\overline{\text{GE}}$) is a viscosity supersolution of ($\widetilde{\text{GE}}$), and a viscosity solution of ($\overline{\text{GE}}$) with $\bar{G}$ replaced by $\underline{G}$ is a viscosity subsolution of ($\widetilde{\text{GE}}$). Then we already get the following existence result for the problem ($\widetilde{\text{GE}}$).

Theorem 12 *Suppose* $\bar{G}$ *and* $\widetilde{G}$ *satisfy the same conditions given in Theorem* 11, $\bar{G}(t,x,0,0,0)$ *is bounded,* $\widetilde{G}(t,x,0,0,0) = 0$ *for* $(t,x) \in [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d$ *and* $\varphi \in C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ *with polynomial growth. Then there is a unique solution of* ($\widetilde{\text{GE}}$).

Now we construct nonlinear expectations $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}$ with respect to $\bar{G}$ and $\widetilde{G}$ respectively as in section (3.1). To make sure the nonlinear expectations have constant preserving property, we make the following assumption:

(h). $\bar{G}(t,x,v,0,0) \equiv 0$, for any $(t,x,v) \in [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}$.

Remark 8 *If* $\bar{G}$ *satisfies conditions* (a), *then the condition* (h) *results in that* $\bar{G}$ *does not depend on the third argument. In fact, we have*

$$\bar{G}(t,x,v,p,A) - \bar{G}(t,x,0,p,A) \le \bar{G}(t,x,v,0,0) = 0$$

and

$$\bar{G}(t,x,0,p,A) - \bar{G}(t,x,v,p,A) \le \bar{G}(t,x,-v,0,0) = 0,$$

which mean $\bar{G}(t,x,v,p,A) \equiv \bar{G}(t,x,0,p,A)$.

If $\bar{G}$ *satisfies condition* (b), *then* $\bar{G}(t,x,0,0,0) \equiv 0$, *which implies that the only solution of the problem* ($\overline{\text{GE}}$) *is* 0 *when* $\varphi \equiv 0$. *But this is not enough for the well-definedness of the related nonlinear expectation, since the constant preserving property does not hold. Let us see an example. Consider the parabolic PDE:*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u(t,x) - \{\bar{G}(t,x,Du(t,x),D^2u(t,x)) + u(t,x)\} = 0, (t,x) \in (0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}, \\ u(0,x) = c, x \in \mathbb{R}, \end{cases}$$

where c is a constant and $\bar{G}$ satisfies (b),(c),(d) *and* (g)*. The solution to the problem is $u(t,x) = ce^t$. By the same construction as in section 3.1, we will derive the same contradiction as in Remark 4.*

For this specific $\bar{G}$, we can defined the operator $\mathcal{T}$ as $\mathcal{T}_t[\varphi(\cdot)](x) := e^{-t}u(t,x)$, which guarantees the expectation derived from the PDE is constant preserving. But this nonlinear expectation is the same as the one derived from the nonlinear PDE

$$\partial_t w(t,x) - \bar{G}(t,x,Dw(t,x),D^2w(t,x)) = 0,$$

since $w(t,x) = e^{-t}u(t,x)$ is its solution.

From now on, we always assume that $\bar{G}$ satisfies conditions (a),(b),(c),(d),(g) and (h), and $\widetilde{G}$ satisfies conditions (DOM), (g) and $\widetilde{G}(t,x,0,0,0) \equiv 0$. Then we also have

$$\widetilde{G}(t,x,v,p,A) \equiv \widetilde{G}(t,x,0,p,A)$$

by (DOM) and (h), thus $\widetilde{G}$ also satisfies (h).

Denote the nonlinear expectations derived from $(\overline{\text{GE}})$ and $(\widetilde{\text{GE}})$ by $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}$ respectively. Then we can similarly show that $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ satisfies all the properties in Properties 5, while $\widetilde{G}$ satisfies Proposition 5 (I),(IV),(V),(VII) and is dominated by $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ in the sense

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_t[\xi] - \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_t[\eta] \leq \bar{\mathcal{E}}_t[\xi - \eta], \text{ for } \xi, \eta \in \mathcal{H}, t \geq 0.$$

Since Lemma 6 holds for $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}[\xi] \leq \bar{\mathcal{E}}[\xi]$, Lemma 6 still holds for $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}$.

Let $d = 1$. To derive (4) for $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}$, we need enough regularity for the solution of $(\widetilde{\text{GE}})$. We refer to Krylov's regularity results, assume that $\widetilde{G}$ belongs to the class $\bar{F}(\varepsilon, K, Q)$ defined in Section 6.1 in Krylov [K87]. Thus, by Theorem 6.4.4 in Krylov [K87], we get (4) for $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}$ by noticing that Remark 6. Theorem 8 also holds for $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}$, since Lemma 6 still holds for $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}$ is dominated by $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$.

We summarize the above discussion as the following theorem.

Theorem 13 (Martingale Problem for $\widetilde{G}$) *Assume that $\widetilde{G}$ satisfies conditions* (g), (h) *and* (DOM)*, where $\bar{G}$ satisfies conditions* (a),(b),(c),(d),(g) *and* (h)*. Suppose $\widetilde{G} \in \bar{F}(\varepsilon, K, Q)$. If $\varphi \in C_b^{2+\alpha_0}(\mathbb{R})$, $\alpha_0 > 0$ or φ is a polynomial on $\mathbb{R}$. Then we have*

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_s[\varphi(X_t) - \varphi(X_s) - \int_s^t \widetilde{G}\left(\theta, X_\theta, \varphi(X_\theta), \varphi_x(X_\theta), \varphi_{xx}(X_\theta)\right) d\theta] = 0, \ 0 \leq s \leq t < \infty. \tag{6}$$

Remark 9 (Comparison of Two Kinds of Martingale Problems) *We note here that both of the Theorems (Theorem 7 and Theorem 13) cannot contain each other. Because, in general, G defined in section 2 does not satisfies condition* (g)*, the $\hat{G}$ defined in Theorem 28 is an example. While the G considered in section 3.1 is only a sublinear function. In the following sections, we only consider the sublinear case developed in section 3.1.*

4 Stochastic Integral and Ito's Formula

In this section, we will first define the quadratic variation process and the stochastic integral with respect to the process X. We will then derive the related Itô's formula. Finally, we will generalize the same procedure to $Y = \int \sigma(X)dX$.

4.1 Some technical Lemmas

We will first derive some useful results from Section 3.

Lemma 14 *For any given $s, t \in [0, \infty)$ with $s < t$, we have*

$$|\mathcal{E}_s[\pm(X_t - X_s)]| \le L|t - s|, \tag{7}$$

where L is the Lipschitz constant of G.

Proof. By Theorem 8 and the subadditivity of $\mathcal{E}_s$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_s[X_t - X_s] &= \mathcal{E}_s[X_t - X_s - \int_s^t G(X_\theta, 1, 0)\, d\theta + \int_s^t G(X_\theta, 1, 0)\, d\theta] \\
&\le \mathcal{E}_s[X_t - X_s - \int_s^t G(X_\theta, 1, 0)\, d\theta] + \mathcal{E}_s[\int_s^t G(X_\theta, 1, 0)\, d\theta] \\
&= \mathcal{E}_s[\int_s^t G(X_\theta, 1, 0)\, d\theta] \\
&\le \mathcal{E}_s\left[\left|\int_s^t G(X_\theta, 1, 0)\, d\theta - \int_s^t G(X_\theta, 0, 0)\, d\theta\right|\right] \\
&\le L \int_s^t d\theta \\
&= L(t - s).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, one can show

$$\mathcal{E}_s[X_s - X_t] \le L(t - s).$$

Notice that $-\mathcal{E}_s[\xi] \le \mathcal{E}_s[-\xi]$, hence the result by combining the above two inequalities. □

Lemma 15 *Given $T > 0$. Let $t \in [0, T]$ and $h > 0$ such that $t_i = t + ih \in [0, T], i = 0, 1, 2, 3$. Then we have the following estimates*

$$\mathcal{E}_t[(X_{t+h} - X_t)^{2n}] \le C(n, L, T)h^n, \tag{8}$$

$$|\mathcal{E}_t[\pm(X_{t+2h} - X_{t+h})(X_{t+h} - X_t)]| \le L\sqrt{C(1, L, T)}h^{\frac{3}{2}}, \tag{9}$$

$$\mathcal{E}_t[|(X_{t_1} - X_{t_0})(X_{t_2} - X_{t_1})(X_{t_3} - X_{t_2})|] \le C(1, L, T)^{\frac{3}{2}}h^{\frac{3}{2}}, \tag{10}$$

where $C(n, L, T)$ is a constant depending only on n, L and T. In particular,

$$\mathcal{E}[|X_t|^m] \le C(\mathcal{E}[|X_t - X_0|^m] + |X_0|^m) \le C(t^{\frac{m}{2}} + |X_0|^m) < \infty,\ t \in [0, T].$$

Proof. We prove (8) by induction.

First, let $n = 1$. By the construction of the conditional expectation we have $\mathcal{E}_t[(X_{t+h} - X_t)^2] = \mathcal{E}_t[(X_{t+h} - y)^2]_{y=X_t}$, then by Theorem 8, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_t[(X_{t+h} - y)^2] \leq &(X_t - y)^2 + \mathcal{E}_t[\int_t^{t+h} G(X_\theta, 2(X_\theta - y), 2)\, d\theta] \\
\leq &(X_t - y)^2 + \mathcal{E}_t[\int_t^{t+h} L(2|X_\theta - y| + 2)\, d\theta] \\
\leq &(X_t - y)^2 + 2L\int_t^{t+h} \mathcal{E}_t[|X_\theta - y|]\, d\theta + 2Lh \\
\leq &(X_t - y)^2 + L\int_t^{t+h} \mathcal{E}_t[|X_\theta - y|^2]\, d\theta + 3Lh.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we derive the inequality

$$\mathcal{E}_t[(X_{t+h} - X_t)^2] \leq L\int_t^{t+h} \mathcal{E}_t[|X_\theta - X_t|^2]\, d\theta + 3Lh,$$

then by Gronwall's inequality we have proved

$$\mathcal{E}_t[(X_{t+h} - X_t)^2] \leq C(1, L, T)h,$$

where $C(1, L, T) = \max\{3L, \frac{3}{2}L^2Te^{LT}\}$.

Now assume that the inequality holds for $n = k - 1, k \geq 2$, we can show

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_t[(X_{t+h} - X_t)^{2k}] \leq &\mathcal{E}_t[\int_t^{t+h} G(X_\theta, 2k(X_\theta - X_t)^{2k-1}, 2k(2k-1)(X_\theta - X_t)^{2k-2})\, d\theta] \\
\leq &2kL\int_t^{t+h} \mathcal{E}_t[|X_\theta - X_t|^{2k-1}]\, d\theta + 2k(2k-1)L\int_t^{t+h} \mathcal{E}_t[|X_\theta - X_t|^{2(k-1)}]\, d\theta \\
\leq &kL\int_t^{t+h} \mathcal{E}_t[|X_\theta - X_t|^{2k}]\, d\theta + [k + 2k(2k-1)]L\int_t^{t+h} \mathcal{E}_t[|X_\theta - X_t|^{2(k-1)}]\, d\theta \\
\leq &kL\int_t^{t+h} \mathcal{E}_t[|X_\theta - X_t|^{2k}]\, d\theta + C(k-1, L, T)(4k-1)Lh^k,
\end{aligned}$$

then again by Gronwall's inequality we have proved inequality (8) for $n = k$. Therefore, by induction, we get (8).

For (9), we only prove the inequality

$$\mathcal{E}_t[(X_{t+2h} - X_{t+h})(X_{t+h} - X_t)] \leq Ch^{\frac{3}{2}},$$

the remaining steps are similar to the proof for (7).

By Proposition 5 (VI) and (7), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{E}_{t+h}[(X_{t+2h} - X_{t+h})(X_{t+h} - X_t)] \\
&= (X_{t+h} - X_t)^+\mathcal{E}_{t+h}[X_{t+2h} - X_{t+h}] + (X_{t+h} - X_t)^-\mathcal{E}_{t+h}[-(X_{t+2h} - X_{t+h})] \\
&\leq Lh|X_{t+h} - X_t|.
\end{aligned}$$

Then by (8), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{E}_t[(X_{t+2h}-X_{t+h})(X_{t+h}-X_t)]\\
\leq &Lh\mathcal{E}_t[|X_{t+h}-X_t|]\\
\leq &Lh\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_t[(X_{t+h}-X_t)^2]}\\
\leq &\sqrt{C(1,L,T)}Lh^{\frac{3}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

To see the last estimate (10), again by Proposition 5 (VI) and (8) one can easily derive

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{E}_t[|(X_{t_1}-X_{t_0})(X_{t_2}-X_{t_1})(X_{t_3}-X_{t_2})|]\\
\leq &\frac{1}{2}\{\mathcal{E}_t[(X_{t_1}-X_{t_0})^2|X_{t_3}-X_{t_2}|]+\mathcal{E}_t[(X_{t_2}-X_{t_1})^2|X_{t_3}-X_{t_2}|\}\\
\leq &\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{E}_t[(X_{t_1}-X_{t_0})^2\mathcal{E}_{t_2}[|X_{t_3}-X_{t_2}|]+\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{E}_t[(X_{t_2}-X_{t_1})^2\mathcal{E}_{t_2}[|X_{t_3}-X_{t_2}|]\\
\leq &\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{C(1,L,T)}h^{\frac{1}{2}}\{\mathcal{E}_t[(X_{t_1}-X_{t_0})^2]+\mathcal{E}_t[(X_{t_2}-X_{t_1})^2]\}\\
\leq &C(1,L,T)^{\frac{3}{2}}h^{\frac{3}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

$\square$

4.2 Stochastic Integral and Quadratic Process of X

Now we proceed to define the quadratic variational process $\langle X\rangle$ of the canonical process X. It is completed in two steps. The first step is to define $\langle X\rangle$ for a special fixed partition Π_N on any given interval $[0,T]$. The second step is to show that this particular choice of definition is well-defined. That is, any other partition will yield the same limit as the step size goes to 0.

Step 1. Given $T>0$, for $s,t\in[0,T]$ such that $s<t$, denote the partition of the interval $[s,t]$ by $\Pi_N\equiv\Pi_N(s,t):=\{t_k;t_k=k(t-s)/N,k=0,1,\ldots,N\}$, $N\in\mathbb{N}$, and the step size by $h\equiv h(s,t):\equiv(t-s)/N$. Now define

$$V_{s,t}(\Pi_N):=\sum_{\Pi_N}|X_{t_{k+1}}-X_{t_k}|^2,$$

and let

$$V_n\equiv V_n(s,t):=V_{s,t}(\Pi_{2^n}),n\in\mathbb{N}.$$

Lemma 16 *$\{V_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence under $L^2_{\mathcal{E}}$ norm.*

Proof. Set $\delta V_n=V_{n+1}-V_n$ and $h=\dfrac{t-s}{2^n}$. To show $\{V_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence, it suffices to prove

$$\mathcal{E}[(\delta V_n)^2]\leq Ch^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

with the constant C independent of n.

Noticing that V_{n+1} is defined by adding the midpoints to the partition Π_{2^n}, we can denote the midpoints by $s_k := (t_k + t_{k+1})/2 = t_k + h/2$. Then we can rewrite δV_n as

$$\begin{aligned}\delta V_n &= \sum_{\Pi_{2^n}} [(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{s_k})^2 + (X_{s_k} - X_{t_k})^2 - (X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k})] \\ &= 2\sum_{\Pi_{2^n}} (X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{s_k})(X_{t_k} - X_{s_k}).\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}(\delta V_n)^2 =& 4[\sum_{\Pi_{2^n}} (X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{s_k})(X_{t_k} - X_{s_k})]^2 \\ =& 4\sum_{\Pi_{2^n}} [(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{s_k})(X_{t_k} - X_{s_k})]^2 \\ &+ 8 \sum_{0\le i<j\le 2^n-1} (X_{t_{i+1}} - X_{s_i})(X_{t_i} - X_{s_i})(X_{t_{j+1}} - X_{s_j})(X_{t_j} - X_{s_j}) \\ =&: 4I + 8J.\end{aligned}$$

Now we estimate $\mathcal{E}[I]$ and $|\mathcal{E}[J]|$, respectively. Let us consider $|\mathcal{E}[J]|$ first. By Proposition 5 (VI), (7) and (10), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}[J] &= \mathcal{E}[\sum_{0\le i<j\le 2^n-1} (X_{t_{i+1}} - X_{s_i})(X_{t_i} - X_{s_i})(X_{t_{j+1}} - X_{s_j})(X_{t_j} - X_{s_j})] \\ &\le \sum_{0\le i<j\le 2^n-1} \mathcal{E}[(X_{t_{i+1}} - X_{s_i})(X_{t_i} - X_{s_i})(X_{t_{j+1}} - X_{s_j})(X_{t_j} - X_{s_j})] \\ &\le \sum_{0\le i<j\le 2^n-1} \mathcal{E}[|(X_{t_{i+1}} - X_{s_i})(X_{t_i} - X_{s_i})(X_{t_j} - X_{s_j})|\mathcal{E}_{s_j}[X_{t_{j+1}} - X_{s_j}] + \mathcal{E}_{s_j}[-(X_{t_{j+1}} - X_{s_j})]|] \\ &\le Lh \sum_{0\le i<j\le 2^n-1} \mathcal{E}[|(X_{t_{i+1}} - X_{s_i})(X_{t_i} - X_{s_i})(X_{t_j} - X_{s_j})|] \\ &\le Lh \sum_{0\le i<j\le 2^n-1} Ch^{\frac{3}{2}} \\ &\le Ch^{\frac{1}{2}},\end{aligned}$$

where C is a constant depending only on L and T, may different from line to line. Then we drive $|\mathcal{E}[J]| \le Ch^{\frac{1}{2}}$ as in the proof of (7).

For $\mathcal{E}[I]$, (8) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}[I] &= \mathcal{E}[\sum_{\Pi_{2^n}}[(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{s_k})(X_{t_k} - X_{s_k})]^2] \\
&\leq \sum_{\Pi_{2^n}} \mathcal{E}[(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{s_k})^2(X_{t_k} - X_{s_k})^2] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\Pi_{2^n}}\{\mathcal{E}[(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{s_k})^4] + \mathcal{E}[(X_{t_k} - X_{s_k})^4]\} \\
&\leq C\sum_{\Pi_{2^n}} h^2 \\
&\leq Ch.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we have proved the estimate

$$\mathcal{E}[(\delta V_n)^2] \leq C(h^{\frac{1}{2}} + h).$$

We are done. ∎

Given Lemma 16, we now define the quadratic variation process $\langle X \rangle$ as the limit of $\{V_n\}$ under $L^2_{\mathcal{E}}$ norm.

Definition 4 *The quadratic variation process $\langle X \rangle$ is the limit of $\{V_n\}$ under $L^2_{\mathcal{E}}$ norm. That is,*

$$\langle X \rangle_t \overset{L^2_{\mathcal{E}}}{:=} \lim_{n\to\infty} V_n(0,t).$$

The next step is to show that this definition is well defined.

Step 2 To this, we establish two lemmas.

Lemma 17 *Given any partition Π of $[T_0, T_1] \subset [0, T]$ denoted by*

$$\Pi = \{t_k, 0 \leq k \leq K : T_0 = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_K = T_1, K \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

We have

$$|\mathcal{E}_{T_0}[\pm[(X_{T_1} - X_{T_0})^2 - \sum_{\Pi}(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k})^2]]| \leq C(T_1 - T_0)^{\frac{3}{2}},$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{T_0}[[(X_{T_1} - X_{T_0})^2 - \sum_{\Pi}(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k})^2]^2] \leq C(T_1 - T_0)^2,$$

where C is a constant depending only on L and T.

Lemma 18 *Given any two partitions Π_1 and Π_2 of the interval $[T_0, T_1] \subset [0, T]$, where*

$$\Pi_1 = \{s_i, 0 \leq i \leq M : T_0 = s_0 < s_1 < \cdots < s_M = T_1\} \text{ and}$$
$$\Pi_2 = \{t_j, 0 \leq j \leq N : T_0 = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_N = T_1\},$$

with

$$\|\Pi_1\| = \max\{|s_{i+1} - s_i|; 0 \le i \le M-1\} \text{ and } \|\Pi_2\| = \max\{|t_{j+1} - t_j|; 0 \le j \le N-1\}.$$

We have

$$\mathcal{E}[[\sum_{\Pi_1}(X_{s_{i+1}} - X_{s_i})^2 - \sum_{\Pi_2}(X_{t_{j+1}} - X_{t_j})^2]^2] \to 0, \text{ as } \|\Pi_1\|, \|\Pi_2\| \to 0.$$

We leave the proofs of the two lemmas to **Appendix B**, and see immediately the well-definedness of quadratic variation process $\langle X \rangle$ follows: For any partition Π of the interval $[s,t] \subset [0,T]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{E}[[\sum_{\Pi}(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k})^2 - (\langle X\rangle_t - \langle X\rangle_s)]^2]\\ \le\, &2\mathcal{E}[[\sum_{\Pi}(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k})^2 - V_n(s,t)]^2] + 2\mathcal{E}[[V_n(s,t) - (\langle X\rangle_t - \langle X\rangle_s)]^2] \to 0,\end{aligned}$$

as $\|\Pi\| \to 0, n \to \infty$, and Lemma 16.

Proposition 19

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_s[|\langle X\rangle_t - \langle X\rangle_s|] &\le C_1|t-s|,\\ \mathcal{E}_s[(\langle X\rangle_t - \langle X\rangle_s)^2] &\le C_2|t-s|^2,\end{aligned}$$

where $C_1 = C(1,L,T)$ *and* $C_2 = C(2,L,T)$.

Proof. Here we only give the proof of the second inequality. Using the same notations as in the proof of Lemma 16, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{E}_s[(\langle X\rangle_t - \langle X\rangle_s)^2]\\ \le\, &2\mathcal{E}_s\left[[(\langle X\rangle_t - \langle X\rangle_s) - \sum_{\Pi_{2n}}(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k})]^2\right] + 2\mathcal{E}_s\left[[\sum_{\Pi_{2n}}(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k})^2]^2\right]\\ =:\, &2\tilde{I} + 2\tilde{J}.\end{aligned}$$

By (8), we can estimate $\tilde{J}$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{J} &= \mathcal{E}_s\left[[\sum_{\Pi_{2n}}(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k})^2]^2\right]\\ &\le N\sum_{\Pi_{2n}}\mathcal{E}_s[(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k})^4]\\ &\le N^2 C(2,L,T)\frac{(t-s)^2}{N^2}\\ &= C(2,L,T)(t-s)^2.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\tilde{I} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, letting $n \to \infty$, we have proved the second inequality. □

Remark 10 *Note that we do not know yet the continuity of its path from the definition of the quadratic variation process* $\langle X \rangle$.

Now, we define define Itô type stochastic integral for $\varphi \in C_{l.Lip}(\mathbb{R})$ with respect to X.

Definition 5 (Itô type stochastic integral) *Given $T > 0$. For any $\varphi \in C_{l.Lip}(\mathbb{R})$, the stochastic integral $\int_s^t \varphi(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta, s, t \in [0, T]$ and $s \leq t$ is defined as the limit of*

$$\sum_{\Pi_{2^n}} \varphi(X_{t_k})(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k})$$

under the $L^2_{\mathcal{E}}$ norm.

Similar to the proof of the quadratic process of X, one sees that this definition is well defined. Moreover, we have the followings.

Proposition 20 *Under the $L^2_{\mathcal{E}}$ norm,*

$$2\int_s^t X_\theta\, dX_\theta = X_t^2 - X_s^2 - (\langle X\rangle_t - \langle X\rangle_s), s \leq t, s, t \in [0, T]. \tag{11}$$

Proposition 21 *Given $T > 0$ and $s, t \in [0, T]$ such that $s < t$. Then*

$$|\mathcal{E}_s[\pm \int_s^t (X_\theta - X_s)\, dX_\theta]| \leq C|t - s|^{\frac{3}{2}}. \tag{12}$$

Proof. By Definition 5, it suffices to show

$$\left|\mathcal{E}_s\left[\pm\left[\sum_{\Pi_{2^n}} X_{t_k}(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k}) - X_s(X_t - X_s)\right]\right]\right| \leq C|t - s|^{\frac{3}{2}}. \tag{13}$$

To prove (13), we proceed similarly as in the proof of (7). Let $N = 2^n$ and $h = (t - s)/N$. By Proposition 5 (VI), (7) and (8), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{E}_s[\sum_{\Pi_{2^n}} X_{t_k}(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k}) - X_s(X_t - X_s)] \leq \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \mathcal{E}_s[(X_{t_k} - X_s)(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k})]\\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \mathcal{E}_s[|X_{t_k} - X_s|[\mathcal{E}_{t_k}[X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k}] + \mathcal{E}_{t_k}[-(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k})]]]\\
&\leq 2Lh\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \mathcal{E}_s[|X_{t_k} - X_s|]\\
&\leq 2\sqrt{C(1, L, T)}Lh\sum_{k=0}^{N-1}(kh)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq 2\sqrt{C(1, L, T)}L|t - s|^{\frac{3}{2}}\frac{1}{N^{\frac{3}{2}}}\frac{N^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}}\\
&= \sqrt{2C(1, L, T)}L|t - s|^{\frac{3}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Since $\mathcal{E}[|\int_s^t \eta_\theta\, d\langle X\rangle_\theta|] \le C\int_s^t \mathcal{E}[|\eta_\theta|]\, d\theta$ for simple process η, by Proposition 19. We can define $\mathcal{E}[\int_s^t \varphi(X_\theta)\, d\langle X\rangle_\theta]$ for such φ, for which $\mathcal{E}[|\varphi(X_\cdot)|]$ is integrable on $[0,T]$. For example, if $\varphi\in C(\mathbb{R})$ has polynomial growth, then $\mathcal{E}[\int_s^t \varphi(X_\theta)\, d\langle X\rangle_\theta]$ is well-defined. Furthermore, we can define the integral $\int \varphi(X)\, d\langle X\rangle$ with respect to the quadratic variation process $\langle X\rangle$.

Definition 6 *For any $\varphi\in C_{l.Lip}(\mathbb{R})$, $\int_s^t \varphi(X_\theta)\, d\langle X\rangle_\theta$, $s,t\in[0,T]$ and $s\le t$ is defined as the $L^2_{\mathcal{E}}$-limit*

$$\sum_{\Pi_{2^n}} \varphi(X_{t_k})(\langle X\rangle_{t_{k+1}} - \langle X\rangle_{t_k}). \tag{14}$$

In particular, we have

Proposition 22 *Given $T>0$ and $s,t\in[0,T]$ such that $s<t$. Assume $\varphi\in C(\mathbb{R})$ has polynomial growth. Then*

$$\sum_{\Pi_{2^n}} \varphi(X_{t_k})(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k})^2 \to \int_s^t \varphi(X_\theta)\, d\langle X\rangle_\theta \qquad \text{in } L^2_{\mathcal{E}}.$$

Proof. Using the notations as in the proof of Lemma 16, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{E}[|\sum_{\Pi_{2^n}} \varphi(X_{t_k})(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k})^2 - \int_s^t \varphi(X_\theta)\, d\langle X\rangle_\theta|^2] \\
\le{}& 2\mathcal{E}[|\sum_{\Pi_{2^n}} \varphi(X_{t_k})(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k})^2 - \sum_{\Pi_{2^n}} \varphi(X_{t_k})(\langle X\rangle_{t_{k+1}} - \langle X\rangle_{t_k})|^2] \\
&+ 2\mathcal{E}[|\sum_{\Pi_{2^n}} \varphi(X_{t_k})(\langle X\rangle_{t_{k+1}} - \langle X\rangle_{t_k}) - \int_s^t \varphi(X_\theta)\, d\langle X\rangle_\theta|^2] \\
=:{}& 2\bar{I} + 2\bar{J}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now by Proposition 5 (VI), Corollary 19, Propositions 20, and 21, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{I} &= \mathcal{E}[|\sum_{\Pi_{2n}}\varphi(X_{t_k})(X_{t_{k+1}}-X_{t_k})^2-\sum_{\Pi_{2n}}\varphi(X_{t_k})(\langle X\rangle_{t_{k+1}}-\langle X\rangle_{t_k})|^2] \\
&\le 2\sum_{k=0}^{N-1}\mathcal{E}[\varphi(X_{t_k})^2[(X_{t_{k+1}}-X_{t_k})^2-(\langle X\rangle_{t_{k+1}}-\langle X\rangle_{t_k})]^2] \\
&\quad +2\sum_{0\le i<j\le N-1}\mathcal{E}[\varphi(X_{t_i})\varphi(X_{t_j})[(X_{t_{i+1}}-X_{t_i})^2-(\langle X\rangle_{t_{i+1}}-\langle X\rangle_{t_i})][(X_{t_{j+1}}-X_{t_j})^2-(\langle X\rangle_{t_{j+1}}-\langle X\rangle_{t_j})]] \\
&\le 4\sum_{k=0}^{N-1}\mathcal{E}[\varphi(X_{t_k})^2[(X_{t_{k+1}}-X_{t_k})^4+(\langle X\rangle_{t_{k+1}}-\langle X\rangle_{t_k})^2]] \\
&\quad +2\sum_{0\le i<j\le N-1}\mathcal{E}\Big[\,|\varphi(X_{t_i})\varphi(X_{t_j})[(X_{t_{i+1}}-X_{t_i})^2-(\langle X\rangle_{t_{i+1}}-\langle X\rangle_{t_i})]| \\
&\qquad \{|\mathcal{E}_{t_j}[(X_{t_{j+1}}-X_{t_j})^2-(\langle X\rangle_{t_{j+1}}-\langle X\rangle_{t_j})]|+|\mathcal{E}_{t_j}[-(X_{t_{j+1}}-X_{t_j})^2+(\langle X\rangle_{t_{j+1}}-\langle X\rangle_{t_j})]|\}\Big] \\
&\le C\sum_{k=0}^{N-1}h^2+C\sum_{0\le i<j\le N-1}h^{\frac{3}{2}}\sqrt{\mathcal{E}[(X_{t_{i+1}}-X_{t_i})^4+(\langle X\rangle_{t_{i+1}}-\langle X\rangle_{t_i})^2]} \\
&\le C\left(N\frac{|t-s|^2}{N^2}+N^2\frac{|t-s|^{\frac{5}{2}}}{N^{\frac{5}{2}}}\right)\to 0,\ \text{as } N\to\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\bar{J}\to 0$ as $n\to\infty$. Letting $n\to\infty$, we are done. □

Now we can establish Itô type formula.

Theorem 23 (Itô formula) *Given $T>0$, and $s,t\in[0,T]$ such that $s<t$. Assume $\varphi\in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ with $\varphi',\varphi''\in C_{l.Lip}(\mathbb{R})$. Then we have*

$$\varphi(X_t)-\varphi(X_s)=\int_s^t\varphi'(X_\theta)\,dX_\theta+\frac{1}{2}\int_s^t\varphi''(X_\theta)\,d\langle X\rangle_\theta. \tag{15}$$

Proof. We still use the notations in Lemma 16, and get

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi(X_t)-\varphi(X_s) &= \sum_{\Pi_{2n}}[\varphi(X_{t_{k+1}})-\varphi(X_{t_k})] \\
&= \sum_{\Pi_{2n}}[\varphi'(X_{t_k})(X_{t_{k+1}}-X_{t_k})+\frac{1}{2}\varphi''(X_k)(X_{t_{k+1}}-X_{t_k})^2+\eta_k],
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\eta_k=[\varphi''(X_k+\lambda_k(X_{t_{k+1}}-X_{t_k}))-\varphi''(X_k)](X_{t_{k+1}}-X_{t_k})^2$$

with the random variable $\lambda_k\in[0,1]$. Noticing that $\varphi''\in C_{l.Lip}(\mathbb{R})$, by (8), we derive the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}[|\eta_k|^2] &= \mathcal{E}[|[\varphi''(X_k+\lambda_k(X_{t_{k+1}}-X_{t_k}))-\varphi''(X_k)](X_{t_{k+1}}-X_{t_k})^2|^2] \\
&\le C\mathcal{E}[(X_{t_{k+1}}-X_{t_k})^6]\le Ch^3,
\end{aligned}$$

where C is a constant independent of k. Thus

$$\mathcal{E}[|\sum_{\Pi_{2^n}} \eta_k|^2] \leq N \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \mathcal{E}[|\eta_k|^2] \to 0, \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Thanks to Definition 5 and Proposition 22, we have proved (15). $\square$

4.3 Stochastic integral for general $Y = \int \varphi(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta$

Theorem 24 *Suppose $\varphi \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ and $\varphi, \varphi' \in C_{l.Lip}(\mathbb{R})$. For $s, t \in [0, T]$ such that $s < t$, one can define $\langle \int_s^\cdot \varphi(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta \rangle_t$ as the $L^2_\mathcal{E}$ limit of the sequence*

$$\sum_{\Pi_{2^n}} \left(\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \varphi(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta \right)^2 .$$

If we set $\varphi^{(m)}(X_\theta) = \sum_{\Pi_{2^m K}} \varphi(X_{s_l}) \mathbf{1}_{[s_l, s_{l+1})}(\theta)$, $K \in \mathbb{N}$, then one can define $\langle \int_s^\cdot \varphi^{(m)}(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta \rangle_t$ as the $L^2_\mathcal{E}$ limit of the sequence

$$\sum_{\Pi_{2^n}} \left(\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \varphi^{(m)}(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta \right)^2 .$$

The proof of the theorem relies on the following Lemma.

Lemma 25 *Suppose $\varphi \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ and $\varphi, \varphi' \in C_{l.Lip}(\mathbb{R})$. Then we have the estimates*

$$\mathcal{E}_s[(\int_s^{s+h} \varphi(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta)^2] \leq Ch, \tag{16}$$

$$\mathcal{E}_s[(\int_s^{s+h} \varphi(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta)^4] \leq Ch^2, \tag{17}$$

where $h > 0, s, s+h \in [0, T]$ and C depends on φ, L and T.

Proof. First, set $\Phi(x) := \int_0^x \varphi(y)\, dy$, one can see $\Phi \in C_{l.Lip}(\mathbb{R})$. Then by Itô's formula (Theorem 23), we get

$$\int_s^{s+h} \varphi(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta = \Phi(X_{s+h}) - \Phi(X_s) - \frac{1}{2} \int_s^{s+h} \varphi'(X_\theta)\, d\langle X \rangle_\theta.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_s[(\int_s^{s+h} \varphi(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta)^2] &= \mathcal{E}_s[(\Phi(X_{s+h}) - \Phi(X_s) - \frac{1}{2} \int_s^{s+h} \varphi'(X_\theta)\, d\langle X \rangle_\theta)^2] \\ &\leq 2\mathcal{E}_s[(\Phi(X_{s+h}) - \Phi(X_s))^2] + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{E}_s[(\int_s^{s+h} \varphi'(X_\theta)\, d\langle X \rangle_\theta)^2] \\ &\leq C(h + h^2),\end{aligned}$$

where we used (8) and the estimate

$$\mathcal{E}_s[(\int_s^{s+h}\varphi'(X_\theta)\,d\langle X\rangle_\theta)^2]\le Ch^2,$$

which is a result of the definition of the integral.

Similar computation can show (17). □

Proof of Theorem 24. Denote

$$I_n=\sum_{\Pi_{2^n}}\left(\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}}\varphi(X_\theta)\,dX_\theta\right)^2.$$

By (17), we get $\mathcal{E}[I_n^2]\le C(t-s)$, i.e. $I_n\in L^2_{\mathcal{E}}$. Now, it suffices to show $\mathcal{E}[|I_n-I_{n+1}|^2]\le Ch^{\frac{1}{2}}, h=\frac{t-s}{2^n}$, with C independent of n. Let $s_k=(t_k+t_{k+1})/2$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{E}[|I_n-I_{n+1}|^2]\\
=&\mathcal{E}\left[\left|\sum_{\Pi_{2^n}}\left(\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}}\varphi(X_\theta)\,dX_\theta\right)^2-\left(\int_{t_k}^{s_k}\varphi(X_\theta)\,dX_\theta\right)^2-\left(\int_{s_k}^{t_{k+1}}\varphi(X_\theta)\,dX_\theta\right)^2\right|^2\right]\\
\le&4\sum_{\Pi_{2^n}}\mathcal{E}\left[\left(\int_{t_k}^{s_k}\varphi(X_\theta)\,dX_\theta\right)^2\left(\int_{s_k}^{t_{k+1}}\varphi(X_\theta)\,dX_\theta\right)^2\right]\\
&+8\sum_{i<j}\mathcal{E}\left[\left(\int_{t_i}^{s_i}\varphi(X_\theta)\,dX_\theta\right)\left(\int_{s_i}^{t_{i+1}}\varphi(X_\theta)\,dX_\theta\right)\left(\int_{t_j}^{s_j}\varphi(X_\theta)\,dX_\theta\right)\left(\int_{s_j}^{t_{j+1}}\varphi(X_\theta)\,dX_\theta\right)\right]\\
\le&C(\sum_{\Pi_{2^n}}h^2+\sum_{i<j}h^{\frac{5}{2}})\\
\le&Ch^{\frac{1}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

by (16) and

$$\mathcal{E}_{s_j}\left[\pm\left(\int_{s_j}^{t_{j+1}}\varphi(X_\theta)\,dX_\theta\right)\right]\le Ch,$$

a result of (7) and Proposition 21.

To show the second part, we denote

$$I_{m,n}=\sum_{\Pi_{2^n}}\left(\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}}\varphi^{(m)}(X_\theta)\,dX_\theta\right)^2,$$

and $\delta=s_{l+1}-s_l=\frac{t-s}{K2^m}$. For a given $m\in\mathbb{N}$, when n is large enough, $h<\delta$, we have

$$\left(\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}}\varphi^{(m)}(X_\theta)\,dX_\theta\right)^2=\begin{cases}\varphi(X_{s_l})^2(X_{t_{k+1}}-X_{t_k})^2, & \text{if } s_l\le t_k<t_{k+1}<s_{l+1},\\ [\varphi(X_{s_l})(X_{s_{l+1}}-X_{t_k})+\varphi(X_{s_{l+1}})(X_{t_{k+1}}-X_{s_{l+1}})]^2, & \text{if } s_l\le t_k<s_{l+1}\le t_{k+1},\end{cases}$$

which follows $I_{m,n} \in L^2_{\mathcal{E}}$ for each n. Similar to the proof of Lemma 16, we can show

$$\mathcal{E}[|I_{m,n} - I_{m,n+1}|^2] \leq Ch^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

which implies that $\{I_{m,n}\}_n$ is a Cauchy sequence. ∎

Proposition 26 *Suppose* $\varphi \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ *and* $\varphi, \varphi' \in C_{l.Lip}(\mathbb{R})$.

$$\left\langle \int_s^{\cdot} \varphi^{(m)}(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta \right\rangle_t = \int_s^t \varphi^{(m)}(X_\theta)^2\, d\langle X\rangle_\theta, \tag{18}$$

$$\left\langle \int_s^{\cdot} \varphi(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta \right\rangle_t = \int_s^t \varphi(X_\theta)^2\, d\langle X\rangle_\theta, \tag{19}$$

and

$$\left\langle \int_s^{\cdot} \varphi^{(m)}(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta \right\rangle_t \to \left\langle \int_s^{\cdot} \varphi(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta \right\rangle_t \text{ in } L^1_{\mathcal{E}} \text{ as } m \to \infty.$$

Proof. First, we are going to prove (18). For a given $m \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{E}\left[\left|\left\langle \int_s^{\cdot} \varphi^{(m)}(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta \right\rangle_t - \int_s^t \varphi^{(m)}(X_\theta)^2\, d\langle X\rangle_\theta\right|^2\right] \\
&\leq 2\mathcal{E}\left[\left|\left\langle \int_s^{\cdot} \varphi^{(m)}(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta \right\rangle_t - \sum_{\Pi_{2^n}} \left(\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \varphi^{(m)}(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta\right)^2\right|^2\right] \\
&\quad + 2\mathcal{E}\left[\left|\sum_{\Pi_{2^n}} \left(\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \varphi^{(m)}(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta\right)^2 - \sum_{\Pi_{2^n}} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \varphi^{(m)}(X_\theta)^2\, d\langle X\rangle_\theta\right|^2\right] \\
&=: 2(\Delta_n^{(1)} + \Delta_n^{(2)}).
\end{aligned}$$

By the definition of these two processes, $\Delta_n^{(1)} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, for $\Delta_n^{(2)}$, we have from (16), (17), Proposition 20 and Proposition 21.

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_n^{(2)} &\leq \sum_{\Pi_{2^n}} \mathcal{E}\left[\left|\left(\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \varphi^{(m)}(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta\right)^2 - \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \varphi^{(m)}(X_\theta)^2\, d\langle X\rangle_\theta\right|^2\right] \\
&\quad + 2\sum_{i<j} \mathcal{E}\Bigg[\left(\left(\int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \varphi^{(m)}(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta\right)^2 - \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} \varphi^{(m)}(X_\theta)^2\, d\langle X\rangle_\theta\right) \\
&\quad \left(\left(\int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \varphi^{(m)}(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta\right)^2 - \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} \varphi^{(m)}(X_\theta)^2\, d\langle X\rangle_\theta\right)\Bigg] \\
&\leq \sum_{\Pi_{2^n}} Ch^2 + \sum_{i<j} Ch^{\frac{5}{2}} \leq Ch^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Letting $n \to \infty$, we get (18).

Now, for (19), it suffices to show the last statement. To this end, note that from the proof of Theorem 24, we have the estimates

$$\mathcal{E}\left[\left|\left\langle \int_s^{\cdot} \varphi^{(m)}(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta \right\rangle_t - I_{m,n}\right|\right] \le \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} \mathcal{E}[|I_{m,i+1} - I_{m,i}|] \le \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} C\left(\frac{t-s}{2^i}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \le C(2^{-\frac{1}{4}})^n,$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}\left[\left|\left\langle \int_s^{\cdot} \varphi(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta \right\rangle_t - I_n\right|\right] \le \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} \mathcal{E}[|I_{i+1} - I_i|] \le \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} C\left(\frac{t-s}{2^i}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \le C(2^{-\frac{1}{4}})^n,$$

where C is independent of m.

For each n, by the definition of Itô's integral, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}[|I_n - I_{m,n}|] &= \mathcal{E}\left[\left|\sum_{\Pi_{2^n}}\left[\left(\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \varphi(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta\right)^2 - \left(\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \varphi^{(m)}(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta\right)^2\right]\right|\right] \\ &\le \sum_{\Pi_{2^n}} \mathcal{E}\left[\left|\left(\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \varphi(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta\right)^2 - \left(\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \varphi^{(m)}(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta\right)^2\right|\right] \\ &\to 0, \ \text{as}\, m \to \infty.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{E}\left[\left|\left\langle \int_s^{\cdot} \varphi^{(m)}(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta \right\rangle_t - \left\langle \int_s^{\cdot} \varphi(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta \right\rangle_t\right|\right] \\ \le\, &\mathcal{E}\left[\left|\left\langle \int_s^{\cdot} \varphi^{(m)}(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta \right\rangle_t - I_{m,n}\right|\right] + \mathcal{E}\left[\left|\left\langle \int_s^{\cdot} \varphi(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta \right\rangle_t - I_n\right|\right] + \mathcal{E}[|I_{m,n} - I_n|] \\ \le\, &C(2^{-\frac{1}{4}})^n + \mathcal{E}[|I_{m,n} - I_n|].\end{aligned}$$

Letting $m \to \infty$, we get

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \mathcal{E}\left[\left|\left\langle \int_s^{\cdot} \varphi^{(m)}(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta \right\rangle_t - \left\langle \int_s^{\cdot} \varphi(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta \right\rangle_t\right|\right] \le C(2^{-\frac{1}{4}})^n,$$

then letting $n \to \infty$, we are done. $\square$

We now consider a general form of Itô formula.

Theorem 27 (General Itô type formula) *Given $T > 0$, for $s, t \in [0, T]$ such that $s < t$. Assume that $\varphi \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ with $\varphi', \varphi'' \in C_{l.Lip}(\mathbb{R})$, and $\gamma \in C^1(\mathbb{R}), \gamma \in C_{l.Lip}(\mathbb{R})$. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(Y_t) - \varphi(Y_s) = &\int_s^t \varphi'(Y_\theta)\alpha(X_\theta)\, d\theta + \int_s^t \varphi'(Y_\theta)\beta(X_\theta)\, d\langle X\rangle_\theta \\ &+ \int_s^t \varphi'(Y_\theta)\gamma(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta + \frac{1}{2}\int_s^t \varphi''(Y_\theta)\gamma^2(X_\theta)\, d\langle X\rangle_\theta.\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

The proof is similar to that of Prop. 6.3 in Chap. III in Peng [P10], with properties of quadratic variation process $\langle X\rangle$ such as Proposition 19.

Remark 11

- *We still cannot define Itô's integral for $\varphi \in C_b(\mathbb{R})$. The reason is that we cannot prove the following inequality*

  $$\mathcal{E}[(\int_s^t \eta_\theta \, dX_\theta)^2] \leq C|t-s|,$$

  for some constant C and simple process η. Actually, to show the above inequality we need a better estimate than (9), i.e. the order of h should be greater than or equal to 2.

- *For the same reason, we cannot establish Itô's formula for the process*

  $$Y_t = Y_0 + \int_0^t \alpha(X_\theta)\, d\theta + \int_0^t \beta(X_\theta)\, d\langle X\rangle_\theta + \int_0^t \gamma(X_\theta)\, dX_\theta, \tag{21}$$

  where $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in C_{b.Lip}(\mathbb{R})$, unless γ is a constant. And we cannot define the quadratic variational process of Y. But we are able to define $\langle Y\rangle$ when some constraints are imposed on γ.

Consistency with original G-framework It is worth pointing out that our construction of stochastic integral is consistent with Peng's [P10] original G-framework, where the quadratic variation process of G-Brownian motion is defined as

$$\langle B\rangle_t := \lim_{\|\pi_t^N\|\to 0} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} (B_{t_{j+1}^N} - B_{t_j^N})^2,$$

where the limit is taken in L_G^2 norm, and $\{\pi_t^N\}_{N\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of partitions of the interval $[0, t]$.

This consistency can be readily seen from Section 4.2.

5 Application to Weak Solution of G-SDE

5.1 Weak Solution of G-SDE

Now, let us consider a special G-SDE

$$\begin{cases} dX_t = b(X_t)dt + r(X_t)d\langle B\rangle_t + \sigma(X_t)dB_t, 0 \leq t \leq T, \\ X_0 = x, \end{cases} \tag{22}$$

where $b, r, \sigma \in C_b^2(\mathbb{R})$, and $\sigma \geq \sigma_0 > 0$ for some constant σ_0. We can also use Peng's [P10] notation to write the G-SDE as

$$X_t = x + \int_0^t b(X_s)\, ds + \int_0^t r(X_s)\, d\langle B\rangle_s + \int_0^t \sigma(X_s)\, dB_s,\ t \in [0, T].$$

Definition 7 (Weak Solution of G-SDE) *A weak solution of G-SDE (22) is a triple* $((\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E}), X, B)$*, where*

i) $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ *is a nonlinear expectation space,*

ii) X *is a continuous process on the nonlinear expectation space* $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$*, and* B *is a G-Brownian motion as defined by Peng [P10],*

iii) the identity

$$X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t b(X_\theta)\, d\theta + \int_0^t r(X_\theta)\, d\langle B\rangle_\theta + \int_0^t \sigma(X_\theta)\, dB_\theta \tag{23}$$

holds in $L^2_{\mathcal{E}}$ *norm.*

Theorem 28 (Existence of Weak Solution) *There exists at least one weak solution of the G-SDE (22). Especially, if we set*

$$\hat{G}(x, p, A) = \frac{1}{2} \sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \{[2r(x)p + \sigma^2(x)A]\gamma\} + b(x)p,$$

where $\Gamma = [\underline{\sigma}^2, \overline{\sigma}^2], \underline{\sigma}^2 > 0$*, then the nonlinear expectation* $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ *derived from the PDE*

$$\partial_t u - \hat{G}(x, u', u'') = 0, \ (t, x) \in (0, T] \times \mathbb{R}, \tag{24}$$

together with the canonical space $\hat{\Omega} = C_x([0, \infty))$ *and the process*

$$B_t = \int_0^t \frac{dX_\theta}{\sigma(X_\theta)} - \int_0^t \frac{b(X_\theta)}{\sigma(X_\theta)}\, d\theta - \int_0^t \frac{r(X_\theta)}{\sigma^3(X_\theta)}\, d\langle X\rangle_\theta,\ t \geq 0 \tag{25}$$

is a weak solution of the G-SDE (22).

Remark 12 *From Remark 2, we know that* $\hat{G}$ *satisfies conditions in Theorem 7.*

To prove the existence result, let us first consider the process defined by (25). By (19), we have

$$\langle B\rangle_t = \int_0^t \frac{1}{\sigma^2(X_\theta)}\, d\langle X\rangle_\theta.$$

Following the approach in the proof of Proposition 21, we can easily get

$$\left| \hat{\mathcal{E}}_s \left[\pm \int_s^t \left(\frac{1}{\sigma^2(X_\theta)} - \frac{1}{\sigma^2(X_s)} \right) d\langle X\rangle_\theta \right] \right| \leq C|t - s|^{\frac{3}{2}}.$$

Then one can easily get

$$\int_0^t r(X_\theta)\, d\langle B\rangle_\theta = \int_0^t \frac{r(X_\theta)}{\sigma^2(X_\theta)}\, d\langle X\rangle_\theta \text{ in } L^2_{\hat{\mathcal{E}}}.$$

Similarly, although more calculations are needed, one can get

$$\int_0^t \sigma(X_\theta)\, dB_\theta = X_t - X_0 - \int_0^t b(X_\theta)\, d\theta - \int_0^t \frac{r(X_\theta)}{\sigma^2(X_\theta)}\, d\langle X\rangle_\theta \text{ in } L^2_{\hat{\mathcal{E}}}.$$

Now, it suffices to show B defined by (25) is a G-Brownian motion. To this end, we refer to the approach in [XZ10]. First, let us see some properties of B.

Lemma 29 (Martingale Properties of B) *Under the nonlinear expectation space $(\hat{\Omega}, \hat{\mathcal{H}}, \hat{\mathcal{E}})$, The process B have the following properties*

i) B is a symmetric $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$-martingale;

ii) the process $\{B_t^2 - \overline{\sigma}^2 t\}$ is an $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$-martingale;

iii) the process $\{\underline{\sigma}^2 t - B_t^2\}$ is an $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$-martingale.

Proof. 1. For simplicity, let $b \equiv 0$. Given any $s, t \in [0, T]$ with $s < t$. To prove i), we need to show

$$\left| \hat{\mathcal{E}}_s \left[\pm \left[\int_s^t \frac{dX_\theta}{\sigma(X_\theta)} - \int_s^t \frac{r(X_\theta)}{\sigma^3(X_\theta)}\, d\langle X\rangle_\theta \right]\right] \right| = 0.$$

First, consider

$$\hat{I} := \hat{\mathcal{E}}_s \left[\int_s^t \frac{dX_\theta}{\sigma(X_\theta)} - \int_s^t \frac{r(X_\theta)}{\sigma^3(X_\theta)}\, d\langle X\rangle_\theta \right].$$

Similar to Lemma 21, we can prove

$$\left| \hat{\mathcal{E}}_s \left[\pm \int_s^t \left(\frac{r(X_\theta)}{\sigma^3(X_\theta)} - \frac{r(X_s)}{\sigma^3(X_s)} \right) d\langle X\rangle_\theta \right] \right| \leq C|t-s|^{\frac{3}{2}}, \tag{26}$$

$$\left| \hat{\mathcal{E}}_s \left[\pm \int_s^t \left(\frac{1}{\sigma(X_\theta)} - \frac{1}{\sigma(X_s)} \right) dX_\theta \right] \right| \leq C|t-s|^{\frac{3}{2}}. \tag{27}$$

Since r is bounded, by Corollary 20, Lemma 21, (26) and (27), we can get

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{I} &= \hat{\mathcal{E}}_s \left[\sum_{\Pi^{2^n}} \left[\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{dX_\theta}{\sigma(X_\theta)} - \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{r(X_\theta)}{\sigma^3(X_\theta)}\, d\langle X\rangle_\theta \right] \right] \\
&\leq \sum_{\Pi^{2^n}} \hat{\mathcal{E}}_s \left[\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{dX_\theta}{\sigma(X_\theta)} - \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \frac{r(X_\theta)}{\sigma^3(X_\theta)}\, d\langle X\rangle_\theta \right] \\
&= \sum_{\Pi^{2^n}} \hat{\mathcal{E}}_s \Bigg[\frac{1}{\sigma(X_{t_k})}(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k}) + \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma(X_\theta)} - \frac{1}{\sigma(X_{t_k})} \right) dX_\theta \\
&\qquad - \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left(\frac{r(X_\theta)}{\sigma^3(X_\theta)} - \frac{r(X_{t_k})}{\sigma^3(X_{t_k})} \right) d\langle X\rangle_\theta - \frac{r(X_{t_k})}{\sigma^3(X_{t_k})}(\langle X\rangle_{t_{k+1}} - \langle X\rangle_{t_k}) \Bigg] \\
&\leq \sum_{\Pi^{2^n}} \hat{\mathcal{E}}_s \left[\frac{1}{\sigma(X_{t_k})}(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k}) - \frac{r(X_{t_k})}{\sigma^3(X_{t_k})}(\langle X\rangle_{t_{k+1}} - \langle X\rangle_{t_k}) \right] + Ch^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&= \sum_{\Pi^{2^n}} \hat{\mathcal{E}}_s \left[\frac{1}{\sigma(X_{t_k})}(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k}) - \frac{r(X_{t_k})}{\sigma^3(X_{t_k})} \left[(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k})^2 - 2\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} (X_\theta - X_{t_k})\, dX_\theta \right] \right] + Ch^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \sum_{\Pi^{2^n}} \hat{\mathcal{E}}_s \left[\frac{1}{\sigma(X_{t_k})}(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k}) - \frac{r(X_{t_k})}{\sigma^3(X_{t_k})}(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k})^2 \right] + Ch^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof of (7), by Theorem 8, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\hat{\mathcal{E}}_s\left[\frac{1}{\sigma(X_{t_k})}(X_{t_{k+1}}-X_{t_k})-\frac{r(X_{t_k})}{\sigma^3(X_{t_k})}(X_{t_{k+1}}-X_{t_k})^2\right]\\
\le&\hat{\mathcal{E}}_s\left[\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}}\hat{G}\left(X_\theta,\frac{1}{\sigma(X_{t_k})}-\frac{2r(X_{t_k})}{\sigma^3(X_{t_k})}(X_\theta-X_{t_k}),-2\frac{r(X_{t_k})}{\sigma^3(X_{t_k})}\right)d\theta\right]\\
\le&\hat{\mathcal{E}}_s\left[\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}}\left[\hat{G}\left(X_\theta,\frac{1}{\sigma(X_{t_k})}-\frac{2r(X_{t_k})}{\sigma^3(X_{t_k})}(X_\theta-X_{t_k}),-2\frac{r(X_{t_k})}{\sigma^3(X_{t_k})}\right)d\theta-\hat{G}\left(X_\theta,\frac{1}{\sigma(X_{t_k})},-2\frac{r(X_{t_k})}{\sigma^3(X_{t_k})}\right)\right]d\theta\right]\\
&+\hat{\mathcal{E}}_s\left[\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}}\hat{G}\left(X_\theta,\frac{1}{\sigma(X_{t_k})},-2\frac{r(X_{t_k})}{\sigma^3(X_{t_k})}\right)d\theta\right]\\
\le&C\hat{\mathcal{E}}_s\left[\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}}\left|\frac{r(X_{t_k})}{\sigma^3(X_{t_k})}(X_\theta-X_{t_k})\right|d\theta\right]+C\hat{\mathcal{E}}_s[\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}}|X_\theta-X_{t_k}|\,d\theta]\\
\le&Ch^{\frac{3}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the identity

$$\hat{G}\left(X_\theta,\frac{1}{\sigma(X_\theta)},-2\frac{r(X_\theta)}{\sigma^3(X_\theta)}\right)=0.$$

Therefore, we have proved $\hat{I}\le Ch^{\frac{1}{2}}\to 0$ as $h\to 0$, i.e. $\hat{I}\le 0$. Similarly, we can show $-\hat{I}\le 0$. Hence, B is a symmetric $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$-martingale.

2. By (16), one can easily get the estimate

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}}_s[(B_t-B_s)^2]\le C|t-s|.$$

Then similar to the construction of $\int_0^t\varphi(X_\theta)\,dX_\theta$ for $\varphi\in C_{l.Lip}(\mathbb{R})$, one can easily define the Itô type integral with respect to B: $\int_0^t\varphi(B_\theta)\,dB_\theta$, by noticing that B is a symmetric $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$-martingale, and $\int_0^\cdot\varphi(B_\theta)\,dB_\theta$ is a symmetric $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$-martingale.

Now by (19), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\hat{\mathcal{E}}_s[B_t^2-\overline{\sigma}^2t]-(B_s^2-\overline{\sigma}^2s)\\
=&\hat{\mathcal{E}}_s[B_t^2-B_s^2]-\overline{\sigma}^2(t-s)\\
=&\hat{\mathcal{E}}_s[\langle B\rangle_t-\langle B\rangle_s]-\overline{\sigma}^2(t-s)\\
=&\hat{\mathcal{E}}_s\left[\int_s^t\frac{1}{\sigma^2(X_\theta)}\,d\langle X\rangle_\theta\right]-\overline{\sigma}^2(t-s).
\end{aligned}$$

We are going to show $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_s[\int_s^t\frac{1}{\sigma^2(X_\theta)}\,d\langle X\rangle_\theta]-\overline{\sigma}^2(t-s)=0$. By Proposition 20 and Proposition 22, it suffices to show the estimate

$$\left|\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{t_k}\left[\frac{1}{\sigma^2(X_{t_k})}(X_{t_{k+1}}-X_{t_k})^2\right]-\overline{\sigma}^2(t_{k+1}-t_k)\right|\le Ch^{\frac{3}{2}},\ t_k,t_{k+1}\in\Pi_{2^n}. \tag{28}$$

Since $G(x, 0, 2/\sigma^2(x)) \equiv \overline{\sigma}^2$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{t_k}\left[\frac{1}{\sigma^2(X_{t_k})}(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k})^2\right] - \overline{\sigma}^2(t_{k+1} - t_k) \\
\leq &\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{t_k}\left[\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \hat{G}\left(X_\theta, \frac{2(X_\theta - X_{t_k})}{\sigma^2(X_{t_k})}, \frac{2}{\sigma^2(X_{t_k})}\right) d\theta\right] - \overline{\sigma}^2(t_{k+1} - t_k) \\
\leq &\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{t_k}\left[\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left[\hat{G}\left(X_\theta, \frac{2(X_\theta - X_{t_k})}{\sigma^2(X_{t_k})}, \frac{2}{\sigma^2(X_{t_k})}\right) - \hat{G}\left(X_\theta, 0, \frac{2}{\sigma^2(X_{t_k})}\right)\right] d\theta\right] \\
&+ \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{t_k}\left[\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left[\hat{G}\left(X_\theta, 0, \frac{2}{\sigma^2(X_{t_k})}\right) - \hat{G}\left(X_\theta, 0, \frac{2}{\sigma^2(X_\theta)}\right)\right] d\theta\right] \\
\leq &C\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{t_k}[\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} |X_\theta - X_{t_k}|\, d\theta] \\
\leq &Ch^{\frac{3}{2}},
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
&- \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{t_k}[\frac{1}{\sigma^2(X_{t_k})}(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k})^2] + \overline{\sigma}^2(t_{k+1} - t_k) \\
\leq &\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{t_k}\left[-\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \hat{G}\left(X_\theta, \frac{2(X_\theta - X_{t_k})}{\sigma^2(X_{t_k})}, \frac{2}{\sigma^2(X_{t_k})}\right) d\theta\right] + \overline{\sigma}^2(t_{k+1} - t_k) \\
\leq &\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{t_k}\left[-\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left[\hat{G}\left(X_\theta, \frac{2(X_\theta - X_{t_k})}{\sigma^2(X_{t_k})}, \frac{2}{\sigma^2(X_{t_k})}\right) - \hat{G}\left(X_\theta, 0, \frac{2}{\sigma^2(X_{t_k})}\right)\right] d\theta\right] \\
&+ \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{t_k}\left[\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \left[\hat{G}\left(X_\theta, 0, \frac{2}{\sigma^2(X_\theta)}\right) - \hat{G}\left(X_\theta, 0, \frac{2}{\sigma^2(X_{t_k})}\right)\right] d\theta\right] \\
\leq &C\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{t_k}[\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} |X_\theta - X_{t_k}|\, d\theta] \\
\leq &Ch^{\frac{3}{2}}.
\end{aligned}
$$

So we obtain (28).

3. Similarly, we can prove iii). ∎

Same as Lemma 5.8 and Lemma 5.10 in [XZ10], we can show the following two lemmas, the proofs are standard. For completeness we give the proofs in **Appendix A**. Now we set $G(A) = \frac{1}{2}\sup_{\gamma\in\Gamma} A\gamma$.

Lemma 30 *i)*

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}}_s[(\int_s^t (B_\theta - B_s)\, dB_\theta)^2] = \hat{\mathcal{E}}_s[\int_s^t (B_\theta - B_s)^2\, d\langle B\rangle_\theta] = \frac{\overline{\sigma}^4}{2}(t-s)^2. \tag{29}$$

ii) For any given $u : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ uniformly continuous, the process $\{\frac{1}{2}\int_0^t u(\theta, B_\theta)\, d\langle B\rangle_\theta - \int_0^t G(u(\theta, B_\theta))\, d\theta\}$ is an $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$-martingale.

Lemma 31 *Let $u(\cdot,\cdot) \in C_b^{1,2}([0,T] \times \mathbb{R})$. Assume that both u_t and u_{xx} are uniformly continuous. Then for any $s, t \in (0,T)$ and $h > 0$ s.t. $s+h, t+h \in (0,T)$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
&u(t, B_{t+h} - B_h) - u(s, B_{s+h} - B_h) \\
&= \int_{s+h}^{t+h} u_t(\theta - h, B_\theta - B_h)\, d\theta + \int_{s+h}^{t+h} u_x(\theta - h, B_\theta - B_h)\, dB_\theta \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_{s+h}^{t+h} u_{xx}(\theta - h, B_\theta - B_h)\, d\langle B \rangle_\theta.
\end{aligned}$$

Consider the G-heat equation

$$\begin{cases} u_t - G(u_{xx}) = 0,\ (t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}, \\ u(0,x) = \varphi(x),\ x \in \mathbb{R}, \end{cases} \tag{30}$$

where $\varphi \in C_{b.Lip}(\mathbb{R})$. We are going to show $u(t,x) := \hat{\mathcal{E}}[\varphi(B_t + x)], \varphi \in C_{b.Lip}(\mathbb{R})$ is the unique solution of G-heat equation (30).

Lemma 32 *If u is the unique viscosity solution of the G-heat equation (30), then*

$$u(t,x) = \hat{\mathcal{E}}[\varphi(B_t + x)].$$

Proof. By Theorem 4, we know $u \in C_b^{1,2}((0,T] \times \mathbb{R})$, and u_t and u_{xx} are both uniformly continuous. By Lemma 31, for $0 < \varepsilon < t \leq T, s \in [0,T]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&u(\varepsilon, B_{s+t-\varepsilon} - B_s + x) - u(t,x) \\
&= \int_s^{s+t-\varepsilon} -u_t(t+s-\theta, B_\theta - B_s + x)\, d\theta + \int_s^{s+t-\varepsilon} u_x(t+s-\theta, B_\theta - B_s + x)\, dB_\theta \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_s^{s+t-\varepsilon} u_{xx}(t+s-\theta, B_\theta - B_s + x)\, d\langle B \rangle_\theta.
\end{aligned}$$

Then we use Lemma 30 to get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\hat{\mathcal{E}}[u(\varepsilon, B_{s+t-\varepsilon} - B_s + x) - u(t,x)] \\
&= \hat{\mathcal{E}}[\int_s^{s+t-\varepsilon} -u_t(t+s-\theta, B_\theta - B_s + x)\, d\theta + \frac{1}{2} \int_s^{s+t-\varepsilon} u_{xx}(t+s-\theta, B_\theta - B_s + x)\, d\langle B \rangle_\theta] \\
&= \hat{\mathcal{E}}[\frac{1}{2} \int_s^{s+t-\varepsilon} u_{xx}(t+s-\theta, B_\theta - B_s + x)\, d\langle B \rangle_\theta - \int_s^{s+t-\varepsilon} G(u_{xx}(t+s-\theta, B_\theta - B_s + x))\, d\theta] \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \hat{\mathcal{E}}[u(\varepsilon, B_{s+t-\varepsilon} - B_s + x)] = u(t,x)$.

We also have

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}}[|u(\varepsilon, B_{s+t-\varepsilon} - B_s + x) - u(0, B_{s+t} - B_s + x)|] \leq C(\varepsilon + \hat{\mathcal{E}}[|B_{s+t-\varepsilon} - B_{s+t}|]) \leq C(\varepsilon + \sqrt{\varepsilon}),$$

since u_t is bounded and φ is Lipschitz continuous.

Hence $u(t,x) = \hat{\mathcal{E}}[\varphi(B_{s+t} - B_s + x)]$, and $u(t,x) = \hat{\mathcal{E}}[\varphi(B_t + x)]$ by the arbitrariness of s. □

Now we can prove the existence theorem.

Proof of Theorem 28. By the definition of G-Brownian motion (see Definition 1.2 in Chapter III in Peng [P10]), we only need to prove that $B_{t+s} - B_t$ is independent from $(B_{t_1}, B_{t_2}, \ldots, B_{t_m}), t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_m \in [0,t]$. Without loss of generality, we prove the case $m = 1$ and $t_1 = s$. To this end, notice Definition 5 and Proposition 22, for any $\psi(\cdot,\cdot) \in C_{b.Lip}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\mathcal{E}}[\psi(B_{t_1}, B_t - B_s)] &= \hat{\mathcal{E}}[\hat{\mathcal{E}}_s[\psi(B_s, B_t - B_s)]] \\
&= \hat{\mathcal{E}}[\hat{\mathcal{E}}_s[\psi(y, B_t - B_s)]_{y=B_s}] \text{ by Definition 5 and Proposition 22} \\
&= \hat{\mathcal{E}}[\hat{\mathcal{E}}[\psi(y, B_{t-s})]_{y=B_s}] \\
&= \hat{\mathcal{E}}[\hat{\mathcal{E}}[\psi(y, B_t - B_s)]_{y=B_s}] \text{ by Lemma 32.}
\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 13 *We note here that the weak solution is not unique. Actually, one can choose different pairs* $(\underline{\sigma}_\circ^2, \overline{\sigma}_\circ^2)$ *to derive different* $\hat{G}_\circ$*, as long as* $\underline{\sigma}_\circ^2 > 0$.

6 Appendix A

To prove Theorem 1, we follow the proof for Theorem 9.1 in Chapter V of Fleming and Soner [FS92] with a slight modification.

First, let us consider the PDE

$$u_t - G(x, Du, D^2u) = 0 \text{ in } Q = (0,T) \times D, \tag{31}$$

where $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ open and bounded, $T > 0$ are given. Denote $\partial Q = ([0,T] \times \partial D) \cup (\{0\} \times D)$.

Theorem 33 *Let* $G \in C(\bar{D} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{S}^d)$ *and satisfies condition* (E). *If* $\underline{u}$ *is a subsolution of* (31) *and* $\overline{u}$ *is a supersolution of* (31)*, then*

$$\sup_{\bar{Q}}(\underline{u} - \overline{u}) = \sup_{\partial Q}(\underline{u} - \overline{u}).$$

Now we need the following lemma to show Theorem 1, before we state the lemma, let us do some calculus.

Suppose that $U \in C^{1,2}([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ is a classical solution of (GE) in $(0,T) \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $B_R = \{x; |x| < R\}$ and $\eta^R \in C^2(B_R)$ be a function satisfying $\eta^R(x) > 0$ whenever $|x| \le R$. Set

$$\hat{U}(t,x) = \eta^R(x)U(t,x), (t,x) \in [0,T] \times \bar{B}_R.$$

Directly calculate, we get

$$\hat{U}_t = \eta^R U_t, \hat{U}_{x_i} = \eta^R U_{x_i} + \eta^R_{x_i} U,$$

$$\hat{U}_{x_i x_j} = \eta^R U_{x_i x_j} + \eta^R_{x_i} U_{x_j} + \eta^R_{x_j} U_{x_i} + \eta^R_{x_i x_j} U.$$

Multiplying the equation in (GE) by η^R, we derive

$$\eta^R U_t - G(x, \eta^R DU, \eta^R D^2 U) = 0,$$

since G satisfies condition (B). Then we can obtain

$$\hat{U}_t - G^R_U(x, D\hat{U}, D^2\hat{U}) = 0, (t,x) \in Q_R, \tag{32}$$

where $Q_R = (0,T] \times B_R$ and $G^R_U(x,p,A) = G(x, p - UD\eta^R(x), A - \frac{1}{\eta^R(x)} D\eta^R(x)p' - \frac{1}{\eta^R(x)} p(D\eta^R(x))' - UD^2\eta^R(x) + 2U\frac{D\eta^R(x)(D\eta^R(x))'}{\eta^R(x)})$.

Lemma 34 *Let $U \in USC([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ (or $U \in LSC([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$) be a viscosity subsolution (supersolution) of (GE). Then $\hat{U}$ is a viscosity subsolution (supersolution) of (32) in $(0,T] \times B_R$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\hat{u} \in C^2(\bar{Q}_R)$ and $\hat{U} - \hat{u}$ has a maximum at $(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \in Q_R$ satisfying $(\hat{U} - \hat{u})(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) = 0$. Set $u(t,x) = \hat{u}(t,x)/\eta^R(x)$. Then $u \in C^2(Q_R)$ and $U - u$ has a maximum at $(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \in Q_R$. Since U is a viscosity subsolution of equation (GE),

$$u_t(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) - G(\bar{x}, Du(\bar{t}, \bar{x}), D^2 u(\bar{t}, \bar{x})) \leq 0.$$

So the calculations preceding the lemma yield

$$\hat{u}_t(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) - G^R_u(\bar{x}, D\hat{u}(\bar{t}, \bar{x}), D^2\hat{u}(\bar{t}, \bar{x})) \leq 0.$$

Since $\hat{U}(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) = \hat{u}(\bar{t}, \bar{x})$, we have $U(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) = u(\bar{t}, \bar{x})$ and consequently

$$G^R_u(\hat{x}, p, A) = G^R_U(\hat{x}, p, A).$$

Hence $\hat{U}$ is a viscosity subsolution of (32) in Q_R. The supersolution property can be proved similarly. □

Lemma 35 *Assume σ, b are uniformly Lipschitz continuous with a common Lipschitz constant L_0. Then there exists a continuous function $\bar{\rho} : [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ with $\bar{\rho}(0) = 0$ such that $G(x, \alpha(x-y), A) - G(y, \alpha(x-y), \bar{A}) \leq \bar{\rho}(\alpha|x-y|^2 + |x-y|)$ for every $x, y \in \mathbb{R}, \alpha > 0$ and $A, \bar{A} \in \mathbb{S}^d$, satisfying*

$$-3\alpha \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \leq \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & -\bar{A} \end{pmatrix} \leq 3\alpha \begin{pmatrix} I & -I \\ -I & I \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proof. By the representation of G, we have

$$G(x, \alpha(x-y), A) - G(y, \alpha(x-y), \bar{A}) \leq \sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}[\sigma(x,\gamma)\sigma'(x,\gamma)A - \sigma(y,\gamma)\sigma'(y,\gamma)\bar{A}] \right\}$$
$$+ \sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \{\alpha |b(x,\gamma) - b(y,\gamma)||x-y|\}.$$

Since b is uniformly Lipschitz continuous, we get

$$\sup_{\gamma\in\Gamma}\{\alpha|b(x,\gamma)-b(y,\gamma)||x-y|\}\leq L_0\alpha|x-y|^2.$$

And we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname{tr}[\sigma(x,\gamma)\sigma'(x,\gamma)A-\sigma(y,\gamma)\sigma'(y,\gamma)\bar{A}]\\
=&\operatorname{tr}\left[\begin{pmatrix}\sigma(x,\gamma)\sigma'(x,\gamma) & \sigma(x,\gamma)\sigma'(y,\gamma)\\ \sigma(y,\gamma)\sigma'(x,\gamma) & \sigma(y,\gamma)\sigma'(y,\gamma)\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}A & 0\\ 0 & -\bar{A}\end{pmatrix}\right]\\
\leq&3\alpha\operatorname{tr}\left[\begin{pmatrix}\sigma(x,\gamma)\sigma'(x,\gamma) & \sigma(x,\gamma)\sigma'(y,\gamma)\\ \sigma(y,\gamma)\sigma'(x,\gamma) & \sigma(y,\gamma)\sigma'(y,\gamma)\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}I & -I\\ -I & I\end{pmatrix}\right]\\
=&3\alpha\operatorname{tr}[\sigma(x,\gamma)\sigma'(x,\gamma)-\sigma(x,\gamma)\sigma'(y,\gamma)-\sigma(y,\gamma)\sigma'(x,\gamma)+\sigma(y,\gamma)\sigma'(y,\gamma)]\\
=&3\alpha\operatorname{tr}[(\sigma(x,\gamma)-\sigma(y,\gamma))(\sigma'(x,\gamma)-\sigma'(y,\gamma))]\\
=&3\alpha\|(\sigma(x,\gamma)-\sigma(y,\gamma))\|^2\\
\leq&3L_0^2\alpha|x-y|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can set $\bar{\rho}(r)=3(L_0^2+L_0)r$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1. Set $\eta^R(x)=\left(\frac{|x|^2}{e^R}-1\right)+\frac{1}{e^R}, |x|<R$. Then $\eta^R\in C^2(B_R)$, and there exists a constant C_0 such that

$$|D\eta^R(x)|\leq\frac{C_0}{e^R},|D^2\eta^R(x)|\leq\frac{C_0}{e^R},\frac{|D\eta^R(x)|^2}{\eta^R(x)}\leq\frac{C_0}{e^{2R}}.$$

Now we set

$$G^R(x,p,A):=G(x,p,A-\frac{1}{\eta^R(x)}D\eta^R(x)p'-\frac{1}{\eta^R(x)}p(D\eta^R(x))'),$$

where $x,p\in\mathbb{R}^d, A\in\mathbb{S}^d$. Since G satisfies condition (D), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|G^R(x,p,A)-G^R_U(x,p,A)\right|\\
=&\Bigg|G(x,p,A-\frac{1}{\eta^R(x)}D\eta^R(x)p'-\frac{1}{\eta^R(x)}p(D\eta^R(x))')\\
&-G(x,p-UD\eta^R(x),A-\frac{1}{\eta^R(x)}D\eta^R(x)p'-\frac{1}{\eta^R(x)}p(D\eta^R(x))'-UD^2\eta^R(x)+2U\frac{D\eta^R(x)(D\eta^R(x))'}{\eta^R(x)})\Bigg|\\
\leq&\rho\left(|UD\eta^R(x)|+|UD^2\eta^R(x)|+\left|2U\frac{D\eta^R(x)(D\eta^R(x))'}{\eta^R(x)}\right|\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\underline{u}$ and $\overline{u}$ have polynomial growth, there exist constants $\underline{C}(R)$ and $\overline{C}(R)$ such that

$$|\underline{u}D\eta^R(x)|+|\underline{u}D^2\eta^R(x)|+\left|2\underline{u}\frac{D\eta^R(x)(D\eta^R(x))'}{\eta^R(x)}\right|\leq\underline{C}(R),$$

$$|\overline{u}D\eta^R(x)|+|\overline{u}D^2\eta^R(x)|+\left|2\overline{u}\frac{D\eta^R(x)(D\eta^R(x))'}{\eta^R(x)}\right|\leq\overline{C}(R),$$

and $\underline{C}(R), \overline{C}(R) \to 0$ as $R \to \infty$.

For $(t,x) \in Q_R$, set $\underline{u}^R(t,x) = \eta^R(x)\underline{u}(t,x) - \rho(\underline{C}(R))(t-T)$ and $\overline{u}^R(t,x) = \eta^R(x)\overline{u}(t,x) + \rho(\overline{C}(R))(t-T)$, then by Lemma 34 we obtain $\underline{u}^R$ and $\overline{u}^R$ are viscosity subsolution and viscosity supersolution of

$$U_t - G^R(x, DU, D^2U) = 0, (t,x) \in Q_R,$$

respectively.

By the former lemma, we see that G satisfies condition (E), and similar to the proof we can also show G^R satisfies condition (E), then we can use Theorem 33 to get

$$\sup_{\bar{Q}_R}(\underline{u}^R - \overline{u}^R) = \sup_{\partial\bar{Q}_R}(\underline{u}^R - \overline{u}^R),$$

and $\underline{u}^R \to \underline{u}, \overline{u}^R \to \overline{u}$ uniformly on compact subsets of $(0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$, and

$$\sup_{[0,T]\times\partial B_R}(\underline{u}^R - \overline{u}^R) \le T(\rho(\underline{C}(R)) + \rho(\overline{C}(R))) + \frac{1}{e^R}(\sup_{[0,T]\times B_R}|\underline{u}| + \sup_{[0,T]\times B_R}|\overline{u}|) \to 0, \text{ as } R \to \infty.$$

Letting $R \to \infty$, we proved the result. ∎

Proof of Lemma 30. (i) Let $t_i = s + ih, h = \frac{t-s}{N}, i = 0, 1, \ldots, N, N \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-1}(B_{t_i} - B_{t_s})(B_{t_i} - B_{t_{i-1}}) \to \int_s^t (B_\theta - B_s)\, dB_\theta \text{ in } L^2_{\hat{\mathcal{E}}}.$$

Then

$$\left(\sum_{i=0}^{N-1}(B_{t_i} - B_{t_s})(B_{t_i} - B_{t_{i-1}})\right)^2 \to \left(\int_s^t (B_\theta - B_s)\, dB_\theta\right)^2 \text{ in } L^1_{\hat{\mathcal{E}}}.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\hat{\mathcal{E}}\left[\left|\hat{\mathcal{E}}_s\left[\left(\int_s^t (B_\theta - B_s)\, dB_\theta\right)^2\right] - \hat{\mathcal{E}}_s\left[\left(\sum_{i=0}^{N-1}(B_{t_i} - B_{t_s})(B_{t_i} - B_{t_{i-1}})\right)^2\right]\right|\right] \\
\le &\hat{\mathcal{E}}\left[\hat{\mathcal{E}}_s\left[\left|\left(\int_s^t (B_\theta - B_s)\, dB_\theta\right)^2 - \left(\sum_{i=0}^{N-1}(B_{t_i} - B_{t_s})(B_{t_i} - B_{t_{i-1}})\right)^2\right|\right]\right] \\
= &\hat{\mathcal{E}}\left[\left|\left(\int_s^t (B_\theta - B_s)\, dB_\theta\right)^2 - \left(\sum_{i=0}^{N-1}(B_{t_i} - B_{t_s})(B_{t_i} - B_{t_{i-1}})\right)^2\right|\right] \to 0.
\end{aligned}$$

So

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}}_s\left[\left(\sum_{i=0}^{N-1}(B_{t_i} - B_{t_s})(B_{t_i} - B_{t_{i-1}})\right)^2\right] \to \hat{\mathcal{E}}_s\left[\left(\int_s^t (B_\theta - B_s)\, dB_\theta\right)^2\right] \text{ in } L^1_{\hat{\mathcal{E}}}.$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned}
&\hat{\mathcal{E}}_s\left[\left(\sum_{i=0}^{N-1}(B_{t_i}-B_{t_s})(B_{t_i}-B_{t_{i-1}})\right)^2\right]\\
=&\hat{\mathcal{E}}_s\left[\sum_{i=0}^{N-1}(B_{t_i}-B_{t_s})^2(B_{t_i}-B_{t_{i-1}})^2\right]\\
=&\overline{\sigma}^4\sum_{i=0}^{N-1}(t_i-s)(t_{i+1}-t_i),
\end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 29.

Therefore,

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}}_s\left[\left(\int_s^t(B_\theta-B_s)\,dB_\theta\right)^2\right]=\lim_{N\to\infty}\overline{\sigma}^4\sum_{i=0}^{N-1}(t_i-s)(t_{i+1}-t_i)=\overline{\sigma}^4\int_s^t\theta\,d\theta=\frac{\overline{\sigma}^4}{2}(t-s)^2.$$

The first identity is easy to derive from Lemma 29.

(ii) Let $\eta_\theta=\sum_{j=0}^{N'-1}u(t_j,B_{t_j})\mathbf{1}_{[t_j,t_{j+1})}(\theta),\theta\in[0,T],N'\in\mathbb{N},0=t_0<t_1<\cdots<t_{N'}=T$, then η is a simple process. Without loss of generality, suppose $t=t_{N'-1}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\hat{\mathcal{E}}_t[\int_0^T\eta_\theta\,d\langle B\rangle_\theta-2\int_0^TG(\eta_\theta)\,d\theta]\\
=&\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{t_{N'-1}}[\sum_{j=0}^{N'-1}u(t_j,B_{t_j})(\langle B\rangle_{t_{j+1}}-\langle B\rangle_{t_j})-2\sum_{j=0}^{N'-1}G(u(t_j,B_{t_j}))(t_{j+1}-t_j)]\\
=&\sum_{j=0}^{N'-2}u(t_j,B_{t_j})(\langle B\rangle_{t_{j+1}}-\langle B\rangle_{t_j})-2\sum_{j=0}^{N'-2}G(u(t_j,B_{t_j}))(t_{j+1}-t_j)\\
&+u(t_{N'-1},B_{t_{N'-1}})^+\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{t_{N'-1}}[\langle B\rangle_{t_{N'}}-\langle B\rangle_{t_{N'-1}}]+u(t_{N'-1},B_{t_{N'-1}})^-\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{t_{N'-1}}[-(\langle B\rangle_{t_{N'}}-\langle B\rangle_{t_{N'-1}})]\\
&-2G(u(t_{N'-1},B_{t_{N'-1}}))(t_{N'}-t_{N'-1})\\
=&\int_0^t\eta_\theta\,d\langle B\rangle_\theta-2\int_0^tG(\eta_\theta)\,d\theta+2G(u(t_{N'-1},B_{t_{N'-1}}))(t_{N'}-t_{N'-1})-2G(u(t_{N'-1},B_{t_{N'-1}}))(t_{N'}-t_{N'-1})\\
=&\int_0^t\eta_\theta\,d\langle B\rangle_\theta-2\int_0^tG(\eta_\theta)\,d\theta.
\end{aligned}$$

Letting $\max\{|t_{j+1}-t_j|\}\to0$, one can easily derive the conclusion. ∎

Proof of Lemma 31. Without loss of generality, assume u,u_t,u_{xx} are all Lipschitz continuous, with a common Lipschitz constant L_u. Let $\pi^N=\{t_i;t_i=s+i\delta,\delta=\frac{t-s}{N},i=0,1,\ldots,N\},N\in\mathbb{N}$ be a partition of interval $[s,t]$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&u(t, B_{t+h} - B_h) - u(s, B_{s+h} - B_h) \\
= &\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} [(u(t_{i+1}, B_{t_{i+1}+h} - B_h) - u(t_i, B_{t_{i+1}+h} - B_h)) + (u(t_i, B_{t_{i+1}+h} - B_h) - u(t_i, B_{t_i+h} - B_h))] \\
= &\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} (u(r_{i+1} - h, B_{r_{i+1}} - B_h) - u(r_i - h, B_{r_{i+1}} - B_h)) + \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} u_x(r_i - h, B_{r_i} - B_h)(B_{r_{i+1}} - B_{r_i}) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} u_{xx}(r_i - h, B_{r_i} - B_h)(B_{r_{i+1}} - B_{r_i})^2 + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} [u_{xx}(r_i - h, B_{r_i} - B_h + \lambda_i(B_{r_{i+1}} - B_{r_i}) \\
&- u_{xx}(r_i - h, B_{r_i} - B_h))](B_{r_{i+1}} - B_{r_i})^2 \\
= &\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \int_{r_i}^{r_{i+1}} u_t(\theta - h, B_{r_{i+1}} - B_h)\, d\theta + \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} u_x(r_i - h, B_{r_i} - B_h)(B_{r_{i+1}} - B_{r_i}) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} u_{xx}(r_i - h, B_{r_i} - B_h)(B_{r_{i+1}} - B_{r_i})^2 + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} [u_{xx}(r_i - h, B_{r_i} - B_h + \lambda_i(B_{r_{i+1}} - B_{r_i}) \\
&- u_{xx}(r_i - h, B_{r_i} - B_h))](B_{r_{i+1}} - B_{r_i})^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where $r_i = t_i + h, \lambda_i \in (0, 1)$. Now

$$\begin{aligned}
&\hat{\mathcal{E}}[|\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \int_{r_i}^{r_{i+1}} u_t(\theta - h, B_{r_{i+1}} - B_h)\, d\theta - \int_{s+h}^{t+h} u_t(\theta - h, B_\theta - B_h)\, d\theta|] \\
\leq &\hat{\mathcal{E}}[\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \int_{r_i}^{r_{i+1}} L_u |B_{r_{i+1}} - B_\theta|\, d\theta] \leq C \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} |r_{i+1} - r_i|^{\frac{3}{2}} \leq CN \left(\frac{t-s}{N}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \to 0 \text{ as } N \to \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} u_x(r_i - h, B_{r_i} - B_h)\mathbf{1}_{[t_i, t_{i+1})}(\theta) \to u_x(\theta - h, B_\theta - B_h),$$

we get

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} u_x(r_i - h, B_{r_i} - B_h)(B_{r_{i+1}} - B_{r_i}) \to \int_{s+h}^{t+h} u_x(\theta - h, B_\theta - B_h)\, dB_\theta \text{ in } L^2_{\hat{\mathcal{E}}}.$$

Since

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\hat{\mathcal{E}}[|\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} u_{xx}(r_i-h,B_{r_i}-B_h)(B_{r_{i+1}}-B_{r_i})^2-\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} u_{xx}(r_i-h,B_{r_i}-B_h)(\langle B\rangle_{r_{i+1}}-\langle B\rangle_{r_i})|^2]\\
=&\hat{\mathcal{E}}[|\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} u_{xx}(r_i-h,B_{r_i}-B_h)\int_{r_i}^{r_{i+1}}(B_\theta-B_{r_i})\,dB_\theta|^2]\\
\leq&\hat{\mathcal{E}}[\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} u_{xx}^2(r_i-h,B_{r_i}-B_h)(\int_{r_i}^{r_{i+1}}(B_\theta-B_{r_i})\,dB_\theta)^2]\\
&+2\hat{\mathcal{E}}[\sum_{i<j} u_{xx}(r_i-h,B_{r_i}-B_h)u_{xx}(r_j-h,B_{r_j}-B_h)\int_{r_i}^{r_{i+1}}(B_\theta-B_{r_i})\,dB_\theta\int_{r_j}^{r_{j+1}}(B_\theta-B_{r_j})\,dB_\theta]\\
\leq&\overline{\sigma}^4\delta^2\sum_{i=0}^{N-1}\hat{\mathcal{E}}[u_{xx}^2(r_i-h,B_{r_i}-B_h)]\\
\leq&C\delta^2\sum_{i=0}^{N-1}\hat{\mathcal{E}}[1+h+|B_{r_i}-B_h|]\to 0 \text{ as } N\to\infty,
\end{aligned}
$$

we obtain

$$
\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} u_{xx}(r_i-h,B_{r_i}-B_h)(\langle B\rangle_{r_{i+1}}-\langle B\rangle_{r_i})\to\int_{s+h}^{t+h}u_{xx}(\theta-h,B_\theta-B_h)\,d\langle B\rangle_\theta \text{ in } L^2_{\hat{\mathcal{E}}}.
$$

We are done. □

7 Appendix B

Proof of Lemma 17. First, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
(X_{T_1}-X_{T_0})^2-\sum_{\Pi}(X_{t_{k+1}}-X_{t_k})^2&=2\sum_{0\leq i<j\leq K-1}(X_{t_{i+1}}-X_{t_i})(X_{t_{j+1}}-X_{t_j})\\
&=2\sum_{j=1}^{K-1}(X_{t_j}-X_{t_0})(X_{t_{j+1}}-X_{t_j}).
\end{aligned}
$$

Then similar to the proof of Lemma 15, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{E}_{T_0}[(X_{T_1}-X_{T_0})^2-\sum_{\Pi}(X_{t_{k+1}}-X_{t_k})^2]| &= 2|\mathcal{E}_{T_0}[\sum_{j=1}^{K-1}(X_{t_j}-X_{t_0})(X_{t_{j+1}}-X_{t_j})]| \\
&\leq 2\sum_{j=1}^{K-1}|\mathcal{E}_{T_0}[(X_{t_j}-X_{t_0})(X_{t_{j+1}}-X_{t_j})]| \\
&\leq 2\sum_{j=1}^{K-1}\mathcal{E}_{T_0}[|X_{t_j}-X_{t_0}|\{\mathcal{E}_{t_j}[X_{t_{j+1}}-X_{t_j}]+\mathcal{E}_{t_j}[-(X_{t_{j+1}}-X_{t_j})]\}] \\
&\leq 4L\sum_{j=1}^{K-1}\mathcal{E}_{T_0}[|X_{t_j}-X_{t_0}|](t_{j+1}-t_j) \\
&\leq 4L\sqrt{C(1,L,T)}\sum_{j=1}^{K-1}\sqrt{t_j-t_0}(t_{j+1}-t_j) \\
&\leq 4L\sqrt{C(1,L,T)}(T_1-T_0)^{\frac{3}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we prove the second estimate, by Lemma 15 we can derive

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{E}_{T_0}[[(X_{T_1}-X_{T_0})^2-\sum_{\Pi}(X_{t_{k+1}}-X_{t_k})^2]^2] \\
\leq\, & 2\mathcal{E}_{T_0}[(X_{T_1}-X_{T_0})^4]+2\mathcal{E}_{T_0}[[\sum_{\Pi}(X_{t_{k+1}}-X_{t_k})^2]^2] \\
\leq\, & 2C(2,L,T)(T_1-T_0)^2+2\{\mathcal{E}_{T_0}[\sum_{\Pi}(X_{t_{k+1}}-X_{t_k})^4]+2\sum_{0\leq i<j\leq K-1}\mathcal{E}_{T_0}[(X_{t_{i+1}}-X_{t_i})^2(X_{t_{j+1}}-X_{t_j})^2]\} \\
\leq\, & 2C(2,L,T)(T_1-T_0)^2+2C(2,L,T)\sum_{k=0}^{K-1}(t_{k+1}-t_k)^2+4C(1,L,T)^2\sum_{0\leq i<j\leq K-1}(t_{i+1}-t_i)(t_{j+1}-t_j) \\
\leq\, & 4[C(2,L,T)+C(1,L,T)^2](T_1-T_0)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Lemma 18. Consider the common refinement $\Pi=\Pi_1\cup\Pi_2$ of these two partition, denoted by

$$\Pi=\{r_l, 0\leq l\leq M+N: T_0=r_0<r_1\leq r_2\leq\cdots\leq r_{M+N-1}<r_{M+N}=T_1\}.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{E}[[\sum_{\Pi_1}(X_{s_{i+1}}-X_{s_i})^2-\sum_{\Pi_2}(X_{t_{j+1}}-X_{t_j})^2]^2] \\
\leq\, & 2\mathcal{E}[[\sum_{\Pi_1}(X_{s_{i+1}}-X_{s_i})^2-\sum_{\Pi}(X_{r_{l+1}}-X_{r_l})^2]^2]+2\mathcal{E}[[\sum_{\Pi_2}(X_{t_{j+1}}-X_{t_j})^2-\sum_{\Pi}(X_{r_{l+1}}-X_{r_l})^2]^2] \\
=:\, & 2\mathring{I}+2\mathring{J}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we estimate $\mathring{I}$, and the estimate of $\mathring{J}$ can be derived similarly. Note that Π contains all the points of Π_1, for each $0 \leq i \leq M-1$, we define $\pi_i = \{r_l, 0 \leq l \leq M+N-1 : s_i \leq r_l \leq r_{l+1} \leq s_{i+1}\}$ as the partition of the interval $[s_i, s_{i+1}]$. Then by Lemma 17, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathring{I} =& \mathcal{E}[[\sum_{\Pi_1}(X_{s_{i+1}} - X_{s_i})^2 - \sum_{\Pi}(X_{r_{l+1}} - X_{r_l})^2]^2] \\
=& \mathcal{E}[\{\sum_{i=0}^{M-1}[(X_{s_{i+1}} - X_{s_i})^2 - \sum_{\pi_i}(X_{r_{l+1}} - X_{r_l})^2]\}^2] \\
\leq& \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} \mathcal{E}[[(X_{s_{i+1}} - X_{s_i})^2 - \sum_{\pi_i}(X_{r_{l+1}} - X_{r_l})^2]^2] \\
&+ 2\sum_{0\leq m<n\leq M-1} \mathcal{E}[[(X_{s_{m+1}} - X_{s_m})^2 - \sum_{\pi_m}(X_{r_{l+1}} - X_{r_l})^2][(X_{s_{n+1}} - X_{s_n})^2 - \sum_{\pi_n}(X_{r_{l+1}} - X_{r_l})^2]] \\
\leq& C\sum_{i=0}^{M-1}(s_{i+1} - s_i)^2 + 2\sum_{0\leq m<n\leq M-1} \mathcal{E}[|(X_{s_{m+1}} - X_{s_m})^2 - \sum_{\pi_m}(X_{r_{l+1}} - X_{r_l})^2| \\
&\{\mathcal{E}_{s_n}[(X_{s_{n+1}} - X_{s_n})^2 - \sum_{\pi_n}(X_{r_{l+1}} - X_{r_l})^2] + \mathcal{E}_{s_n}[-[(X_{s_{n+1}} - X_{s_n})^2 - \sum_{\pi_n}(X_{r_{l+1}} - X_{r_l})^2]]\}] \\
\leq& C\sum_{i=0}^{M-1}(s_{i+1} - s_i)^2 + 4C\sum_{0\leq m<n\leq M-1} \mathcal{E}[|(X_{s_{m+1}} - X_{s_m})^2 - \sum_{\pi_m}(X_{r_{l+1}} - X_{r_l})^2|](s_{n+1} - s_n)^{\frac{3}{2}} \\
\leq& C(T_1 - T_0)\|\Pi_1\| + C(T_1 - T_0)^2\sqrt{\|\Pi_1\|}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Similarly, we can obtain

$$
\mathring{J} \leq C(T_1 - T_0)\|\Pi_2\| + C(T_1 - T_0)^2\sqrt{\|\Pi_2\|}.
$$

Therefore, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{E}[[\sum_{\Pi_1}(X_{s_{i+1}} - X_{s_i})^2 - \sum_{\Pi_2}(X_{t_{j+1}} - X_{t_j})^2]^2] \\
\leq& C(T_1 - T_0)(\|\Pi_1\| + \|\Pi_2\|) + C(T_1 - T_0)^2(\sqrt{\|\Pi_1\|} + \sqrt{\|\Pi_2\|}) \to 0, \text{ as } \|\Pi_1\|, \|\Pi_2\| \to 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

□

Theorem 36 *The quadratic variation process $\langle X \rangle$ exists and can be defined in the way as step 1 in Section 4.2 did.*

Proof. For any partition Π of the interval $[s,t] \subset [0,T]$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{E}[[\sum_{\Pi}(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k})^2 - (\langle X \rangle_t - \langle X \rangle_s)]^2] \\
\leq& 2\mathcal{E}[[\sum_{\Pi}(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k})^2 - V_n(s,t)]^2] + 2\mathcal{E}[[V_n(s,t) - (\langle X \rangle_t - \langle X \rangle_s)]^2] \to 0,
\end{aligned}
$$

as $\|\Pi\| \to 0, n \to \infty$, by Lemma 16 and Lemma 18. □

References

[CIL92] M. G. Crandall, H. Ishii and P.L. Lions (1992), User's Guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations, *Bulletin of The American Mathematical Society* Vol. 27, No.1, July 1992, pp. 1-67.

[FS92] W. H. Fleming and H. M. Soner (1992), *Controlled Markov Processes and Viscosity Solutions*, Springer-Verlag, New York.

[HP09] M. Hu and S. Peng 2009, G-Lévy processes under sublinear expectations, Preprint, see *arXiv:0911.3533v1 [math.PR] 18 Nov 2009.*

[KS91] I. Karatzas and S. E. Shreve (1991), *Brownian Motion and Stochastic Calculus*, 2nd edition, Springer-Verlag, New York.

[K87] N. V. Krylov (1987), *Nonlinear Elliptic and Parabolic Equations of the Second Order*,D.Reidel Publishing Company (Original Russian version by Nauka, Moscow, 1985).

[N12] M. Nutz (2012), Random G-expectations, Preprint, see *arXiv:1009.2168v2 [math.PR] 28 Jun 2012.*

[LP11] X. Li and S. Peng (2011), Stopping times and related Itô's calculus with G-Brownian motion, *Stochastic Processes and Applications* 121(2011), pp. 1492–1508.

[Ø03] B. Øksendal (2003), *Stochastic Differential Equations. An Introduction with Applications*, 6th edition, Springer.

[P05] S. Peng (2005), Nonlinear expectations and nonlinear Markov chains, *Chinese Annals of Mathematics* 26B(2).159-184

[P10] S. Peng (2010), Nonlinear Expectations and Stochastic Calculus under Uncertainty, Preprint, *see arXiv:1002.4546v1 [math.PR] 24 Feb 2010.*

[SV69] D.W. Stroock and S.R.S. Varadhan (1969), Diffusion processes with continuous coefficients,I, *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* Vol.XXII,345-400

[XZ10] J. Xu and B. Zhang (2010), Martingale property and capacity under G-framework, *Electronic Journal of Probability* 15:2041-2068.

[XHZ11] J. Xu, H. Shang and B. Zhang (2011), A Girsanov type theorem under G-framework, *Stochastic Analysis and Applications* 29, pp. 386–406.